National Library of Canada
Canadian Theses Service
Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Services des thèses canadiennes

CANADIAN THESES

THÈSES CANADIENNES

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

NL 339 (r. 86/01)

Canada

0-315-24881-5

National Library of Canada
Canadian Theses Division
Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Division des thèses canadiennes

PERMISSION TO MICROFILM — AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER

• Please print or type — Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

Full Name of Author — Nom complet de l'auteur

Montemurro, Raffaella Hope

Date of Birth — Date de naissance
08-01-42

Country of Birth — Lieu de naissance
CANADA

Permanent Address — Résidence fixe
5519 - 108 St.
EDMONTON ALTA
T6H 2Y8

Title of Thesis — Titre de la thèse

ART IN SCHOOL: AN INTERPRETIVE VIEW OF TWO TEACHERS

University — Université
University of Alberta

Degree for which thesis was presented — Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée
Master of Education

Year this degree conferred — Année d'obtention de ce grade
1984

Name of Supervisor — Nom du directeur de thèse
PAT RAFFERTY

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

Date
Sept 10, 1984

Signature
R. Montemurro

NL-91 (4/77)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

ART IN SCHOOL: AN INTERPRETIVE VIEW OF TWO TEACHERS

by

(C) RAFFAELLA H. MONTEMURRO

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1984

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: Raffaella H. Montemurro

TITLE OF THESIS: "Art in School: An Interpretive View of Two Teachers"

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED: Master of Education

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1984

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(Signed) Raffaella Montemurro

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

5519 - 108 Street

Edmonton, Alberta

T6H 2Y8

DATED Sept. 10, 1984

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Art in School: An Interpretive View of Two Teachers" submitted by Raffaella H. Montemurro in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

Pat Rasberry
Supervisor

J. Allison Forbes

Robert Gibson

Wilma Laing

Date June 28, 1984

ABSTRACT

This study of two generalist teachers (non-specialists in art) teaching art in elementary school classrooms, deals with viewing and interpreting art in school as everyday life. The major purpose of the study was the discovery of the culture which produces art products in the classroom, and the examination of the knowledge that guides art behaviour in the cultural context of the elementary school. The concept of culture espoused for this study was Spradley's (1975): "Culture is the acquired knowledge that people use to interpret experience and to generate social behaviour" (p. 5).

Data were collected through the researcher acting as participant-observer in two classrooms in two different elementary schools. The researcher worked very closely with the two teachers as they taught art and any other lessons where art materials and processes were used. The collection of data took place over a two-month period, from April 15, 1983 to June 16, 1983, using ethnographic technique based on Spradley's (1975) "Ethnographic Discovery Procedures" (pp. 72-107). Participant-observation with extensive interviewing and discussion - both formal and informal - were the major techniques utilized. Lessons and interviews were tape recorded, transcribed and used to formulate further questions and discussions. The study focused on the use of art materials, processes and products, how they were chosen, the reasoning and intent behind the choices, and what they meant to the teachers. Data were analysed according to theories concerned with the sociology of everyday life. The problem for the study arose out of a review of literature concerned with the criticism of art education in the school by art educators.

This study revealed that teachers approach the teaching of art in a taken for granted and routine everyday way, calling upon common sense knowledge which is continually augmented, modified and frequently justified retrospectively. Both teachers in the study appeared to be influenced by cultural phenomena, largely unacknowledged by art educators. Friends, colleagues, periodicals, teachers' conventions and the like influenced the teachers' choices. In other words, knowledge about art was acquired in a highly socialized but routine way. Contrary to the perception of certain art educators, it was found that the two classroom teachers participating in the study did not consider teaching art in school to be problematic. They appeared to feel confident and adequate in doing what they did, secure in their own background knowledge and the affirmation and approval of colleagues within their profession. Personal biographical situations influenced how the teachers objectified what art in school was to them.

This study revealed that art education's specialized knowledge is not necessarily a part of a classroom teacher's common sense everyday thinking. In other words, art in school is one thing to art educators and another to classroom teachers, even though the two groups may share some commonalities in thinking.

The study recommended further research into the powerful culture of the elementary school leading to an understanding of that culture from the stance of the classroom teacher.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the generosity of Professor Pat Rafferty, who gave so willingly of her support, guidance, patience, and friendship, in helping me to complete this work.

I am most grateful for the time, interest and support of Dr. Allison Forbes, Dr. Wilma Laing and Dr. Robert Ware. I appreciate the genuine concern and guidance so generously given by this committee.

Without the cooperation of the teachers who opened their classrooms, their thoughts and their feelings to me, I would not have been able to collect the data necessary for this study. To these teachers, their students, and the principals who made me welcome, I am deeply indebted.

Grateful thanks are also due to my four understanding and self-sufficient children, the wonderful friends who patiently saw me through this process, helped in the editing and politely stifled yawns during endless, frustrating complaints and discussions. I am grateful too, to Merle Martin for her friendship and for her expertise and speed in giving this work legible form.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
ONE	INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM	1
	Background to the Problem	3
	The Importance of Art Education in Schools	3
	Art Education as Materials, Process and Product	4
	Art in School as Problematic	5
	The School as Culture	7
	Culture as Knowledge	8
	Culture in Everyday Life	9
	The Problem	11
	The Study	12
TWO	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	14
	The Nature of Art in the School	14
	Art Education as Materials, Process and Product	16
	Art Education as Problematic	18
	Summary	21
THREE	THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	22
	The Sociology of Everyday Life	22
	The Natural Attitude	23
	Biography	26
	The Intersubjectivity of Everyday Life and Common Sense Knowledge	27
	The Socialization of Knowledge	28
	The Structural Socialization of Knowledge	29
	The Social Origin of Knowledge	31
	The Social Distribution of Knowledge	32
	Common Sense and Special Knowledge	34

CHAPTER		PAGE
FOUR	DESIGN OF THE STUDY	37
	Procedure: An Ethnographic Framework	37
	Ethnographic Techniques	39
	Procedure	44
	The Setting	45
	Entry to the Field	45
	Time Frame	46
FIVE	ANALYSIS OF DATA	47
	Art in the Classroom: An Everyday Reality	48
	A Note on the Setting	48
	Art Materials and Processes as Everyday Life	49
	Materials and Procedures: Organization and Distribution	56
	Choice of Materials As Control of Product	60
	The Socialization of Knowledge: Where Do Ideas Come From?	67
	The Use of Exemplars as Routine Practice	76
	Maxims: Some Rules of Conduct	78
	What Can Be Included as Art	80
	Artistic Children	82
	Justifying What Is Done	83
	Why Teach Art?	85
	The Future of Art in School	87
	Biographical Situation	88
SIX	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	91
	Summary of the Study	91
	Implications and Conclusions	92
	Art In School as Everyday Reality	93
	Art Materials and Processes as Everyday Life	93
	Socialization of Knowledge: Where Do Ideas Come From?	95
	Biographical Situation	98
	Conclusions	99
	Recommendations for Further Research	101
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	103

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

Much has been written about the nature of art education in the elementary school and how it fails to measure up to standards set by art educators. Indeed, classroom teachers do not consider themselves experts in the subject, yet are expected to teach art. Further, it has been suggested that the problems encountered by anyone attempting to understand the educative process in the realm of teaching art, are enormous and difficult (Eisner, 1972).

Current literature and research suggest that art education does not receive the attention and status given to other core subjects. While art educators extol the merits of well-planned art programming for children and are prolific in their publication of texts on the subject, they decry the fact that art is peripheral at best, or non-existent by choice, for far too many students. The question of quality in art education, according to Borsa (1978), "... is a continuing source of puzzlement for educators" (p. 1). The problem for this study arose from my observation that published art educators talk about art in the school in one way and classroom teachers often seem to have another way of teaching art, or "doing art." The classroom teacher's way does not always reflect the materials and processes recommended by art educators. The art educators referred to and quoted in this study

were chosen because their texts are the most often recommended reading in university art education courses. This was ascertained through observation and confirmation by professors at the University of Alberta.

Many of the recommendations and criticisms put forth by art educators, such as Chapman (1978), Eisner (1972), and Feldman (1970), are relevant to those teachers who teach art as specialists at the secondary level but not necessarily so to elementary teachers who are subject. In addition, evaluations of elementary art education programmes often overlook the socializing structures of the school and the pressures exerted upon those who work within that context.

Cultural factors affect very much how a particular group organizes and interprets its environment. Do school art programmes reflect the school culture? Elementary classroom teachers could be key sources of understanding yet there appears to be a paucity of information and research on what classroom teachers think and say about what they do as art in the school. This study focuses on the classroom teacher working with art materials and processes within the context of the school culture. It is hoped that through focusing on art materials and processes and the intentionality of the teacher who chooses them, I will reach an understanding of what is happening there.

Chapter One will present an outline of the problem for this study and the background to that problem. I will briefly discuss the importance of materials and processes as art education, the cultural model as a way of looking at what takes place as art in the school, and the idea that school culture can be viewed as everyday life.

Background to the Problem

The Importance of Art Education in Schools

A large group of influential and renowned writers in the field of education recommend that studies in the visual arts be included in the proper and full education of children. Chapman (1982) believes: "Early and continuous education during the elementary years is just as vital in art as in any other subject" (p. 52). Feldman (1970) tells us that art can be useful, even necessary in learning what life is really like. Eisner (1972) places the value of education in the arts "... in the unique contributions it makes to the individual's experience with and understanding of the world" (p. 9). Concerns for art as cultural communication and as a way of dealing with both natural and designed environments are critical points of view put forth in Art Culture and Environment (McFee and Degge, 1977).

My experience as an art educator and as an advocate of quality art education has led me to believe there is a paradoxical situation existing in the teaching of art in the elementary school. On the one hand, art educators advocate the importance of art in the core of school programmes, and prescribe methodologies, processes and materials which may be used. On the other hand, artifacts and art products on exhibit in many schools frequently bear little resemblance to the products found in illustrated art education text books such as Feldman's Becoming Human Through Art (1970).

It would appear that the advice and recommendations of art educators are not being followed by classroom teachers. Feldman (1970) laments the fact that "art is still taught as if it were an adornment of

gracious living rather than an essential expression of the human spirit" (p. 13). What does the teacher think about what he or she does as art in the school?

Art Education as Materials, Process and Product

Materials and procedures for using these materials, play a large role in art education. When teachers select materials and use them for specific purposes, these materials may be assumed to be media for expressing ideas and can reflect a teacher's curiosity about things. In talking with teachers about their art programmes, it is necessary to speak of materials, processes and the resulting products. It is not always easy to know which came first, the materials, or the idea to be expressed through the material. This study looks at materials, processes and products as a way of discovering the ideas and rationale behind their use.

In assessing current recommended programmes in art education (through a careful reading of both text books and periodicals), it would seem that many art educators believe in using a broad variety of media. McFee and Degge (1977) believe that: "... students need experiences in various media and may have satisfying experiences manipulating media, until an image or idea emerges" (p. 173). They write of students needing opportunities to explore various media such as tempera paint, water color, acrylics and clay, and experiment with such tools as bristle or hair brushes, brayers, sponges, combs, tooth brushes, cardboard strips and a variety of papers. Illustrations in Feldman's Becoming Human Through Art (1970) depict the use of such media processes as oil pastels, papier mache, scrap masks, paper bag masks, wire sculpture, collage assemblage, sketching and photography. One single issue of Arts and Activities (1983) includes articles and instructions

on weaving, fabric sculpture, basketry, block printing, felting and pillow-making. Chapman (1978) suggests such activities as drawing and painting, printmaking and graphic design, photography, film-making, sculpture, woodworking and the making of mini-environments from materials such as styrofoam, cardboard and tubes. The possible variety of media recommended for use in art education is vast.

Although all the writers considered in this study emphasize the aesthetic and appreciative aspects of art education, the major part of the texts is given to materials and processes. The photographs of student-made products illustrating the texts are colourful and attractive. However, having recommended and illustrated a great variety of processes and materials with which to do art, art educators do not see their advice being followed and are disappointed with what they see as art education in the school. Art in school is considered by art educators to be problematic.

Art in School as Problematic

Feldman (1970) writes that teachers can easily become dazzled and confused by the "... plethora of activities and tools and goals and projects" (p. 160) to be considered within the art education programme. Chapman (1982) argues that typical school art projects "... guarantee artlike effects with a minimum of skill and effort" and gives examples: "Place chips of wax crayon between pieces of wax paper, iron the paper flat, and display the result in a window as a 'stained glass design'." She claims that through such activities as this, "schools actually **teach** children that art is frivolous" (p. 57). Efland (1976) goes so far as to identify a "school art style" (pp. 37-44) - a new and different art style that he believes is only marginally related to the heritage of art. What or who is responsible for this state of affairs?

Eisner (1972) suggests the problem might lie in the fact that classroom teachers must cope with many subject areas, and may have inadequate preparation in many of those areas. He writes that this places teachers in a quandary as to how to deal with the teaching of art, the result being frequently the choice of an "ad hoc approach in which teachers hunt for something new and 'interesting' to introduce into the classroom" (p. 25) or teachers resolve their difficulties in planning art curricula by relying on the calendar. Borsa (1978) suggests that administrators might contribute to the problem. She found them to be "generally ill-informed about art" and recommended that art educators work toward making them "aware of the need for art and what the art programme's objectives are in relation to general educational goals" (p. 144). But does it help or change the situation to merely fix the blame on particular groups of people?

Art educators have certain ideas as to what might lie behind this problematic situation. Chapman (1982) suggests the problem might be that educators deal too much with the psychology of making or creating art, that is, with the artistic process, and too little with how responses are influenced by the physical, psychological, or social context in which children encounter and make visual forms. Eisner (1972) says it is believed by some that creativity "develops best when protected by a cloak of mystery" and is actually "incapable of being understood." He suggests that it may be this air of mystery that has led even art educators - those trained in the field of education **and** art - to see research in the field as an "uncomfortable intruder, somehow not belonging to the family of art" (p. 237). I believe these possible answers are too distant from the actual experience of making art in schools. The fact that I still see the same seasonal projects being done as art that I did myself in kindergarten and elementary

school, and that I saw as a beginning student teacher some twenty years ago, has led me to suspect that what needs to be brought into question is the strong, traditional culture of the school.

The School as Culture

Spradley (1975) defines culture as what people know - the socially acquired rules and codes they use to interpret and give meaning to social behaviour. This definition of culture refers to the knowledge people use to interpret actions, objects and events.

The artifacts and art objects on display in schools are not the culture of that school, per se, but are objects which reflect the human activity and belief systems contained therein. So although this study focuses on material things - art materials, processes and products - it is really the organization and meaning of these things which is of interest. These "things" are subject to cultural interpretation. The products reflect the teacher's beliefs and the activity of the children. The products of school art classes as artifacts of the school culture should tell us something of that culture, but will not tell all. Because objects and images are fraught with meaning, they are more than just what can be seen or touched. To discover and understand their extended meaning, it is necessary to visit the makers of these objects and "... watch, listen and ask questions" (Spradley, 1975, p. 308). To understand and interpret experience, that experience must be shared with the participants. Hence, the purpose of this study is to understand art in school through **shared** experiences with materials and processes chosen by the teacher for the purposes of making art. Culture is knowledge, and knowledge guides behaviour. Because much of what has

been observed in art education classes, appears to be traditional in that the same kinds of projects appear in many schools year after year, I believe many of the choices made by teachers are made in routine and "taken for granted" ways. Spradley's (1975) concept of culture, and Schutz' (1962) explication of life as a common sense world intersubjectively experienced by fellow men in typically taken for granted ways, seems particularly applicable to the purpose of this study.

As long ago as 1972, Eisner said that art educators "cannot afford to neglect the general culture of the school because it is one of the most powerful aspects of schooling itself" (pp. 22-23), yet little has changed and that culture **has** been neglected. MacGregor (1982) writes of the necessity of researchers dealing with the "empty center - the inability to fix any one point or moment of absolute significance" (p. 4). In other words, in everyday life one is sometimes conscious of being in a situation without any clear realization of how one got there. Everyday life and its "taken for granted" quality is paramount to understanding art in the school. The situation considered to be problematic - the making of art in the school - has been located by art educators, but an understanding of that situation has not been reached. The everyday reality of the situation has not been recognized sufficiently.

Culture as Knowledge

According to Spradley (1975), "... culture is the acquired knowledge that people use to interpret experience and to generate social behavior." It is "like a recipe for producing behavior and artifacts"

(p. 17). It is this "recipe" for producing art in the school, and how it was arrived at, that is of particular interest to this study. Spradley writes of acquired culture as being two-faceted:

> The cultural knowledge that people discuss, explain, and talk about is called explicit culture. Tacit culture, refers to this shared knowledge that people cannot talk about. (1975, pp. 31-32)

However, the idea that tacit culture cannot be talked about, is only partly true. "The boundary between explicit and tacit cultural knowledge is a **permeable** one. That which is tacit in one situation may become explicit in another" (Spradley, 1975, p. 32). According to Spradley, much of the value in studying artifacts (materials, processes and products) comes from their association with valued aspects of a particular cultural system. To truly discover what these associations are and what hidden meanings the artifacts represent, it is necessary to go to the person responsible for their creation - the classroom teacher. What is being done in the name of art in the school and what does it mean to the teacher? What do teachers suggest is the intention behind what they do?

Culture in Everyday Life

Schutz' notion of multiple realities - that is, the idea that "it is the meaning of our experiences and not the ontological structure of the objects which constitutes reality" (1962, p. 230), - wherein may exist several separate orders of reality, seems particularly applicable when researchers contemplate "peeling the onion" of school culture. Although art may not be taught in precisely the way art educators

recommend, it is part of the school culture and is accepted as a matter of course. In an elementary school, some sort of art-making activity is part of what Schutz would call the "daily, taken for granted, common sense everyday world" (p. 71), an integral part of school life. Culture is knowledge and teachers are accepted as having knowledge of how to "do art" in the classroom.

Schutz offers a way of confronting and understanding the reality of the everyday world as it exists within the culture of the school. Schutz (1962) considers the world of daily life to be an intersubjective world within which and upon which people act amongst their fellows. Cultural rules provide a basis for organized human behaviour and interpretations of experience but these rules do not insure absolute and rigid conformity. Rather, cultural rules are continuously being interpreted and re-interpreted as they are passed on and acted upon (Spradley, 1975, p. 29). Spradley's ethnographic discovery procedures offer a way to uncover hidden barriers to meaning. The strategy of participant observation adopted for this study - sharing experiences with informants, joining them for discussions and listening to them explain and legitimate what it is they are doing - offers the opportunity to observe, understand and interpret this culture. It is more than establishing simple, direct questions and soliciting answers: "One must discover the questions to ask from those whose culture is being investigated." Analysis of the data obtained in this way, takes place through examining statements "for the implicit questions that they contain and that informants are taking for granted" (Spradley, 1975, p. 77).

In as much as art has become typified and incorporated into the culture of the school, it may or may not be relevant to art in the world at large. Schools are social institutions - institutions created by a society for the achievement of socially defined purposes. They are

influenced by a diverse and subtle range of factors that may have their source not only in the immediate school or district, but in other far-reaching and less obvious roots (Eisner, 1979). The culture within this social institution refers to what people - teachers in this case - know and use to interpret experience (Spradley, 1975).

Germane to this study is the use of the term **interpret.** This study is an attempt at understanding how a teacher interprets what art education is, what meaning it has for her, and what factors influence that interpretation. As Spradley (1975) says, cultural rules cannot ensure rigid conformity. In other words, people use their culture and the codes and rules within it; they are not entirely regimented by it. Teachers might well know "rules" for teaching art, but interpretation of those rules is a highly individual and variable factor. There exists "rules for breaking rules" (Spradley, 1975, p. 29).

The Problem

Art educators say that art is a necessary and vital force in our culture and as such deserves a major and secured place within the culture of the school. The provision of certain materials and tools along with sound theoretical knowledge and instruction can ensure art its functions and can enhance all learning. However, art educators also say that what is happening in the schools is a unique art style in itself, peripheral to core subjects, and lacking in artistic universality and worth. If indeed, symbols and artifacts communicate belief systems, then school art must reflect to some degree, the beliefs and values of the culture which produces it. Herein lies the problem:

> The perception of conflict between research and practice is a theme that continues to emerge in art education literature as sure as do dandelions in otherwise well-kept lawns. (Lachapelle, 1982, p. 23)

If it is accepted that art is the communication of a belief system, the assumption must be made that the activities undertaken by teachers - art specialists and generalists - are undertaken in good faith. It appears that the culture in which "school art" is produced, is at least as strong or stronger than the forces of art education.

Crucial to this dilemma is the understanding of the culture of the school - that body of tacit knowledge that accounts for the generation and production of school art as artifacts. Chalmers' (1982) case for the study of art as cultural artifact alone must be modified and extended to include the study of the social network of interaction through which these symbols are manifest and become meaningful to those who are responsible for them. Schutz' (1962) way of confronting reality and everyday life seems particularly apt when attempting to understand the meaning of art in the school and the intention behind it.

The Study

It is the intention of this study to confront the everyday reality of teaching art within an elementary school culture and to experience and interpret that reality from the point of view of the participants. The knowledge a teacher calls upon to enable her to teach art in the school includes theories and ideologies incorporated into the common sense structures through which daily, everyday life is carried out.

Understanding and legitimation of this everyday life takes place through language as well as through the passing on of myths and maxims - those implicit, often unspoken rules of daily life (Douglas, 1973). Through talking and working with two teachers "doing art" within the context of the school, I hope to come to an understanding of the tacit as well as the explicit knowledge a teacher must have to teach art within the culture of the elementary school, and how that knowledge has been transmitted, legitimated and acted upon with the resulting production of art.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Chapter Two presents a review of related literature pertinent to the background of this study. It is concerned with what art educators have to say about the nature of art education, its place within the culture of the school, and how art educators perceive art education in the school as problematic.

The Nature of Art in the School

Art educators are concerned with art as an integral part of children's lives both in and out of the school. The school takes on the responsibility of teaching children about art - what it is and how to do it. Read (1958) believes the very aim of education itself should be the "creation of artists - of people efficient in the various modes of expression" (p. 11). Lowenfeld (1964) views art as a stronghold of creativity within the public schools. Wachowiak (1977) sees the art programme as potentially a "privilege, a revelation, and a joy to observe" as children "create in paint, crayon, paste, clay, wood, yarn, cloth, paper and found materials" (p. 1).

The purposes of art education coincide with those of general education, according to Chapman (1978), who says that children's art experiences in school should be "personally meaningful, authentic as 'art', and relevant to life" (p. 118). She believes art education should focus on learning **about** art and **through** art. The premise that art education is more than just one concurrent subject area among many in schools, is embraced by several prominent art educators. The idea of art education as a social obligation and as a total humanizing experience is expressed clearly in the title of Feldman's Becoming Human Through Art (1970). His broad, humanistic, purportedly anthropological point of view is shared by Chapman (1978) and McFee and Degge (1977). These writers view art as being integral to life as a three-dimensional process with the historical, creative and critical aspects of art being of equal importance. McFee and Degge write that the most critical goal of education in multi-cultural societies is "to equip children of varied cultural backgrounds to cope in the mainstream of the society without causing them to devalue their own cultural background" (1977, p. 10). For them, art is closely tied into values in the way people develop their attitudes towards art. In other words, art education should be undertaken within a cultural context where the whole person is both the subject and the object of humanistic study. Feldman (1970) identifies the task of art education as that of "uniting art and life - at least in the subculture of the school" (p. 137). De Francesco (1958) sees art as the very vitality of social living, recognizing its importance as socializing activity within the culture of the school. He stresses the force of the expressive and creative impulses and the need for ample, varied materials and tools which can expedite these impulses. Art is sometimes seen as a way of providing the means of symbolizing, expressing and communicating values, beliefs and rituals strengthening them in the process (McFee and Degge, 1977; Eisner, 1972).

Chapman (1982) believes that "basic education in art must centre on the **subject** of art." Quality art education is "education for enlightened citizenship in a democratic society." Further, she says that art is "undeniably a significant part of the cultural heritage because the experience of art holds some promise of making one's life more satisfying, and because art enters into the civic and social aspects of our lives" (pp. 36-38). Essentially, art educators believe art does and should play a vital and important role in society and that schools should recognize, act upon and reflect this.

Art Education as Materials, Process and Product

A major part of art education in schools concerns itself with the expressive aspect of art - the making of art. Materials which can be manipulated through some kind of process will lead ultimately to some kind of product. Children enjoy manipulating art materials, and may even without guidance produce works that have strong expressive power (Chapman, 1978). In the art education literature reviewed for this study, writers devote substantial space to the suggestion and use of various materials. As Chapman (1978) says, the two modes of art experience - expression and response - are interdependent, but it appears that the majority of art classes observed in my experience deals with the active manipulation of materials with resulting products.

The materials, tools, and technologies available to a society obviously make up a society's artifacts. So it is within the culture of the school; there exists a relationship between materials and imagery. According to Lowenfeld (1964), such basic art materials as clay, tempera and paper are essential to children, as is the need to identify

properties of materials, and to learn how these materials behave. Chapman (1978) recommends a broad range of materials extending far beyond clay, paint and paper as do MacGregor (1977), Lanier (1982), and de Francesco (1958). Extensive experience with materials is characteristic of art programming in the elementary school. This experience is necessary as "ability to control any medium comes from practice in using it" (Chapman, 1978, p. 58). Chapman cites Broudy's study of mastery when she reminds readers that true mastery involves not only dexterity in manipulation but sound judgment as well. It is impossible to separate art education from the manipulation and use of materials whether those materials be clay, wood, paint, slides, reproduction or original works of art. Chapman (1978) warns, however, that "mere activity and chance successes are poor measures of learning ... one truly creative experience in art is worth a thousand aimless experiments with art media" (pp. 118-119).

An examination of the 1981 to 1983 issues of Art Education and Arts and Activities reveals numerous articles on materials and how to use them, and a multitude of advertisements about where to find and purchase art materials. The suggestions range from the use of clay, paint, felt, soft sculpture, wire sculpture and computer graphics to India ink and white glue. Although Lanier (1982) attempts to present a visual arts introductory programme completely divorced from any hands-on studio work in his recent text, The Arts We See, some critics don't consider this a viable alternative to traditional art programmes. Dennie Wolf (1983), in reviewing the book, believes teaching about viewing requires a balance between doing art and talking and reading about it. The new Alberta Education Elementary Art Education Pilot Curriculum Guide, The Child's Image Making, (1983) acknowledges the components of depicting, expressing, composing and reflecting skills but in its title, reveals

an emphasis on the making of art. In Teaching Children to Draw, Wilson and Wilson (1982) relate the importance of the functions of children's drawing to children's spontaneous exploration of the world and offer a variety of drawing activities and games in which the child's school art can be moved closer to his spontaneous art. Having visited many elementary school classrooms during art periods, it would seem to me that the emphasis in art education is on materials and activity - the productive aspects of art.

Feldman (1970) writes of the desirability of "the new creative situation" which aims at "more than certain kinds of artistic products" and utilizes "an expanded idea of creativity in art education" (p. 190). Feldman says that "art is what you do about something that interests, worries or pleases you" (p. 196). Further, he says:

> It is not desirable however, for a teacher to determine in advance how the entire class will carry out a creative work. When every child executes in the same medium, at the same time, it means that the program has surrendered to logistical or administrative convenience. (p. 207)

And herein lies the implication that art educators perceive art as it is done in many schools, unacceptable or at least, undesirable to them.

Art Education as Problematic

Chapman (1978) notes that because media used by artists are often different from those available to school children, it is essential for children to see original works of art and actual artists at work. The implication is that a unique category of materials, having no parallel or counterpart in the real art world, is used in the creation of "school art" (p. 129). Thus emerges the acknowledgement of a paradox between

what is declaimed and recommended by art educators and what is actually the reality. Art educators, while prescribing what art education is and how it should be done, criticize with a degree of harshness, what teachers actually do as art in the classroom.

MacGregor (1977) gently disparages the "calendar approach" to art programming but reveals a sensitivity to the underlying reasons for this approach, those reasons having to do with ritual, tradition and the special significance of a set of symbols known to children. Eisner (1972) acknowledges the possibility of building a first-rate art programme around significant holidays but only "if one has a clear understanding of how these events can be used to stimulate and focus activities that will develop the aesthetic sensibilities of children" (p. 26).

In a critical assessment on the status of art education in American schools, Instant Art Instant Culture, Chapman (1982) charges that the kind of art done in schools demands little of those who produce it - "minimum skill, little or no knowledge, the least possible effort, and practically no investment of time" (p. xiii). Lowenfeld (1964) refers to this kind of activity as school-type projects - objects that have no significance artistically nor do they serve any real function - "easy projects." He says: "There is no place ... for cutting out paper angels or Pilgrim hats ... mass producing little stereotypes for holidays or seasonal events, since such activities can only make the child feel inadequate and tend to reduce his confidence in his own sense of expression" (pp. 129-130).

Efland (1976) goes so far as to identify a "school art style" - a new and different art style that is only marginally related to the heritage of art. It is not to be confused with spontaneous child art, that "unsupervised forms of graphic expression usually done outside of

school by children for their own satisfaction." He says school art is "a form of art that is produced in the school by children under the guidance and influence of a teacher ... an institutional art style in its own right" (pp. 37-44). Wilson (1974) characterizes this art style as "game-like, conventional, ritualistic and rule-governed," where "conventional themes and materials are fed to children and result in school art with the proper expected look" (pp. 5-6).

Lambert Brittain (1976) observes that art taught in most elementary schools consists of colouring exercises, ditto sheets and "tricky projects" (p. 8). Budahl (1981) gives responsibility for the "form of art" being taught in elementary school to the elementary teacher's "desire for practicality and the continuing presence of 'how-to' books, too often followed indiscriminately" (p. 18). He sees elementary teachers as wanting specific, practical art activities - projects which are particular, cheap and immediately practical, but not necessarily philosophically sound from an art education point of view. As long ago as 1951, Forbes, in a master's thesis on the cultural basis of art education, outlined some persistent problems of art in the school. Chief among these was the low status and relative unimportance of art education. Barkan (1963) points out that art educators have failed to clarify and define the work of art education.

Art educators have clearly been dissatisfied with art in the school for a long time. If the activities in an art classroom do not reflect the activities of art in the world of artists, art historians and public art, it is not enough to challenge and criticize elementary teachers for failing to do the job as prescribed by art educators. The culture of the school itself must be confronted.

Summary

Chapter Two has presented an overview of what art educators say elementary school art should be, how this might be accomplished through a variety of materials and processes, and how they perceive what is actually happening as art in the school, to be unacceptable to them. Art educators view art education, as it exists in many schools, as a paradox. There is a lack of understanding as to why the situation exists as it does. That is, there is a lack of understanding of the culture which exists within the school. The next chapter will present a theoretical stance concerned with the confrontation of the reality of everyday life as a road to understanding the culture of the school.

CHAPTER THREE

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In this chapter I will look at the premises set forth by sociologists Berger, Douglas, Luckmann and Schutz who are concerned with the sociology of everyday life and the common sense individual viewing the world from the natural standpoint. This chapter presents a theoretical framework which examines and recognizes the nature and sources of everyday common sense knowledge and represents the essential theoretical stance from which the data were analysed.

The Sociology of Everyday Life

Douglas (1980) defines the sociology of everyday life as a "sociological orientation concerned with the experiencing, observing, understanding, describing, analysing, and communicating about people interacting in concrete situations" (p. 1). To elaborate this definition further, these "concrete situations" are "natural situations" as opposed to experimentally controlled situations. They occur independently of scientific manipulation. It is important to learn what people feel, perceive, think and do in these natural situations. The researcher begins with the experience and observation of people "interacting in concrete, face-to-face situations" - those situations in which actors or members are engaged with each other in feeling, perceiving, thinking and doing things. It is the mundane, everyday interaction and the knowledge which supports that interaction, that

concerns the researcher. Above all, the sociology of everyday life is concerned with the understanding and analysis of members' meanings - the internal experience of the members that is most relevant to a particular social interaction. The primary understanding must be from the standpoint of the members.

The researcher in the sociology of everyday life accepts as subject matter, the world of conscious experience. It is accepted that the world appears as a familiar one consisting of the numerous inputs of perception in continuous flux. It is the study of thinking, ideas and cognition (Freeman, 1980).

Sociology is concerned with the discovery of the nature of social reality and how it functions through participant-observer research (Douglas, 1973). The commitment is to maintaining the integrity of the phenomena - trying to determine and describe the everyday life in all its properties, as seen by the social actor. The researcher never assumes to know the meaning of things to the actor but **does** assume that determining of meaning will be difficult and problematic. The researcher recognizes too that the actor himself may find it difficult to decide on the correct meaning of things, even though these things may be his own ideas and actions. Uncertainty and ambiguity are omnipresent in any given situation. Out of this uncertainty, choices are made, actions carried out and intentions formulated and modified.

The Natural Attitude

Normally, any social actor takes what phenomenology would call a natural stance or attitude toward everyday life. The natural attitude is much like common sense, a natural outgrowth of our routine, mundane involvement with daily life. It is assumed as we go through the

infinite calendar of daily life activity - playing, loving, making, creating, suffering, wondering - the daily world in which all these events go on is **there.** Though our lives are built upon and structured by this matrix of daily life, the foundation of our mundane existence remains unrecognized in a conscious way. We exist in a world of facts and things, a world of values, a world of pragmatism. Much is accepted as evident and real to us without prior reflection. This everyday life is taken for granted.

Schutz (1962) saw the reality of everyday life as a subject for detailed examination so as to render the "taken for granted" the object of critical inspection. Certain beliefs vary widely across cultures but there is also a commonality in the manner in which individuals regard and address their world. For example, the natural attitude appears to be a constant feature of processes of interpretation. Freeman (1980) explains:

> Regardless of the specific contents of a perspective, the world it reveals is not without some structure and consistency. This availability of an ordered world - so basic to mundane awareness that it escapes all scrutiny - is the subject matter of phenomenological investigation. (p. 116)

Schutz (1962) believed the taken for granted everyday world to be the nuclear presupposition of all the strata of man's reality:

> The central and most cunning feature of the taken for granted everyday world is that it is taken for granted ... we naively assume that this world has a history, a past, that it has a future, and that the rough present in which we find ourselves is epistemically given to all normal men in much the same way. (p. xxvi)

That is, the world existed before our birth, was experienced and interpreted by others - our predecessors - and is now handed down and given to our experience and interpretation. Schutz explains:

> All interpretation of this world is based on a stock of previous experiences, these experiences in the form of 'knowledge at hand' function as a scheme of reference. (1962, p. 7)

Things or events become meaningful to us through what we already know of the world. The world is accepted as being a world of more or less well circumscribed objects. It is largely unquestioned, though is at any time, questionable. In other words, we seldom question these typifications although we could. This is similar to Spradley's (1975) idea that the barrier to understanding and apprehending cultural knowledge is "a **permeable** one" (p. 32). These usually unquestioned pre- experiences are typified, that is, they carry open horizons of anticipated similar experiences (Schutz, 1962).

Teachers typify the doing of art. For example, a large hog bristle brush may exemplify a certain type of art activity. That these types of materials belong to the larger group of materials identified with doing art, may or may not be of importance at a particular moment. It may be that the presence of a hog bristle brush would signify tempera painting on large sheets of cream manilla to an art educator, when in fact, to a particular teacher, one brush may be much like another. The intention may be to use this brush with small discs of watercolour paint or to spread glue. Actual experience will or will not confirm anticipation of the typical conformity of this object with associated other objects. "In general" the use of these materials according to previous experience of self and others, implies doing art in a typified way. The particular

use of a material or tool at a certain time, is distinguishable from all other activities which share certain, typical characteristics and identifying features of appearance and behaviour, because of the particular and unique biographical situation of the actor/teacher. Transmitted information such as the appropriate use of hog bristle brushes and tempera, has a certain historicity and objectivity to it but its meaning must be fitted into a biographical framework uniquely his or her own. This brings us to a very important aspect of the phenomena of everyday life: biographical situation.

Biography

An individual acting in the social world defines the reality encountered. The world is transposed into a personal one according to unique elements of biography. Schutz (1962) writes:

> Man finds himself at any moment of his daily life in a biographically determined situation, that is, a physical and socio-cultural environment as defined by him, within which he has his position, not merely his position in terms of physical space and outer time or of his status and rule within the social system but also his moral and ideological position. To say that this definition of the situation is biographically determined is to say that is has its history; it is the sedimentation of all man's previous experiences, organized in the habitual possessions of stock of knowledge at hand, and as such his unique possession, given to him and him alone. (p. 9)

Everyday life then, biographically determined and taken for granted is known as a world shared and understood in common. A teacher works from

a unique biographical situation with a stock of knowledge at hand which is familiar and comfortable "until further notice" or until it is questioned or beomes problematic. She is constantly defining and redefining the reality encountered in accordance with her own "system of relevances" - those elements among all others contained in such a situation which are relevant for the purpose at hand (Schutz, 1962).

The Intersubjectivity of Everyday Life and Common Sense Knowledge

Intersubjectivity is taken for granted as a quality of our daily life. It is taken for granted that we have or can obtain knowledge of other minds. Everyday life is an intersubjective world of culture:

> It is intersubjective because we live among other men, bound to them through common influence and work, understanding others and being understood by them. It is a world of culture because, from the outset, the world of everyday life is a universe of significance to us, that is, a texture of meaning which we have to interpret in order to find our bearings within it and come to terms with it.
>
> (Schutz, 1962, p. 11)

Knowledge of the world is not a private affair but is highly socialized. Spradley (1975) believes all defininitions of culture "imply a theory with implicit assumptions about human beings." He defines culture as the acquired knowledge that people use to interpret experience and to generate social behaviour, and further elaborates the concept of culture to be "what people know, the codes and rules that are socially acquired" (p. 5).

That "texture of meaning" of which Schutz speaks, originates in human actions - our own, our contemporaries' and our predecessors'. It is this that distinguishes culture from nature. It is socially derived and acquired. Cultural objects - tools, symbols, language, artworks - cannot be understood without reference to the human activity from which they originate. School artworks cannot be understood without direct reference to the activities of the human subjects who produce them - the teacher and the students. We are always conscious of the historicity of culture which we encounter in customs, routines, and traditions. We cannot fully understand a tool, a sign or a symbol without knowing what it stands for in the mind of the person who uses it. Knowledge always has social relativity.

Everyday life is biographically determined and intersubjectively taken for granted. Much of it is lived in a routine mundane way, unquestioned but capable of being questioned. Knowledge of the world is acquired in a highly socialized way and is used to interpret and give meaning to what is said and done.

The Socialization of Knowledge

Douglas (1980) tells us that "the pervasiveness of inter-subjectivity is evident in even the most common place experiences" (p. 122). For example, I write this paper as a solitary undertaking but it is not a private one. I recognize the objects about me as books and take it for granted that in consulting them, my understanding of knowledge will be improved. I take for granted the intelligibility of what is written there, however complex, and likewise assume that what I am writing will be intelligible to others. I write with a particular audience in mind and take for granted that my own and their stock of knowledge includes knowledge of my situation and its limits. The task

of writing this paper is pragmatic in that it is dominated by recipe knowledge - knowledge limited to pragmatic competence in routine everyday performances. Likewise, a principal may have recipe knowledge of what to do to get an exhibit of student work up in a school hallway for a special event. His motive is that he wants a display for a particular time and he needs only to set the wheels in motion in much the same way one does when applying for a magazine subscription or a credit card. It is not necessary to know how this is done once you have filled out the application form. Interest will only be aroused in the whole inner workings of the situation if what is expected fails to appear - if the situation becomes problematic. Typically, there is little need or interest in going beyond this recipe knowledge in daily life as long as there are not special problems presented. Therefore, for all practical purposes, the principal knows how to get the mural done for the hallway.

However, there are several aspects of this socialized stock of knowledge which must be considered if we are to take into account that the world and our knowledge of it is intersubjective in nature.

The Structural Socialization of Knowledge

Schutz (1962) considers that in the natural attitude of common sense thinking in everyday life, we assume (and assume that others do also) that we exist in the world with intelligent fellow actors. Objects of the world are either known to us or knowable by us. The world of everyday life is a world shared with others, as real to them as it is to us. Others may have a perspective on this world that is not totally identical with mine, yet I know that I can and do live

with them in a common world and that "there is an ongoing correspondence between **my** meanings and **their** meanings in this world, that we share a common sense about its reality" (Berger and Luckmann, 1967, p. 23). It is also taken for granted that the knowledge shared by those who participate in it, is a socially derived stock of knowledge. Through participation in a stock of knowledge, we can assume and take for granted that if we were to exchange positions with another, it would be possible for each to see the world as the other does. Freeman (1980) says: "The issue is not whether a reciprocity exists but whether it is **believed** to exist" (p. 123). Schutz (1962) says of reciprocity:

> We assume that both of us have selected and interpreted the actually or potentially common objects and their features in an identical manner or at least ... one sufficient for all practical purposes. (p. 12)

There exists, then, a stock of knowledge shared by members of a group who share a system of relevances and as such

> ... it is the origin of the many recipes for handling things and men in order to come to terms with typified situations, of the folkways and mores .... (p. 13)

It is likely that art educators, as members of an "in group" who share common systems of relevances, participate in quite a different stock of knowledge than do classroom teachers who do not consider themselves experts in art education. As Teacher A said: "I'm just a generalist in art." Implicit in this statement is the acknowledgement that a teacher is expected to operate from multiple levels of knowledge. As Berger and Luckmann (1967) say:

> The social stock of knowledge differentiates reality by degrees of familiarity. It provides complex and detailed information concerning those sectors of everyday life with which I must frequently deal. It provides much more general and imprecise information on remoter sectors. (p. 43)

The world is structured in terms of routines applying under varying sets of circumstances. "I know what to do" in regard to these everyday life events. Everyday life is dominated by pragmatic motives, that is, recipe knowledge based on certain taken for granted and shared assumptions. My stock of knowledge at hand is at any moment of my life structured as having zones of clarity, distinctiveness and precision. I may have a lot of knowledge in one small field, that is, I am an expert in this small field, but may have no knowledge in many other fields (Schutz, 1962).

The Social Origin of Knowledge

My individual knowledge and perspective originates only partially within my own personal experiences. The major part is socially derived - handed down to me by my friends, family, teachers and colleagues. The development of a person's knowledge and perspective must always be viewed from within a socio-historical context. To participate in a society is to share in a stock of knowledge, a heritage of accumulated learning (Schutz, 1962). This ongoing social interaction with others allows us to both see the world as culture prescribes, and to participate in that prescription. This intimate connection between social existence and intersubjectivity is fundamental and irresistable. It is impossible to exist in everyday life without interacting and communicating continually with others. There is an ongoing correspondence between **their** meanings and **my** meanings, yet these

meanings are shared in a common sense reality in our recognition of the world. As we internalize society in new contexts and situations, so do we act upon society. Berger (1963) says:

> Society penetrates us as much as it envelopes us. Our bondage to society is not so much established by conquest as by collusion ... we are entrapped by our own social nature. The walls of our imprisonment were there before we appeared on the scene, but they are ever rebuilt by ourselves. We are betrayed into captivity with our own cooperation. (p. 121)

This sociological claustrophobia is not such a negative force as Berger's metaphor might imply. This "bondage to society" includes our way of life, our ways of dealing with the environment, and our efficient recipes for typifying means and ends. It is everyday life. It is not to be thought of in a threatening, morbid way but should be acknowledged and recognized in our consciousness as a constant ongoing process. According to Schutz (1962), "the typifying medium **par excellence** by which socially derived knowledge is transmitted is the vocabulary and syntax of everyday language" (p. 14). Schutz defines this everyday language as the vernacular language of named things and events. Schutz views this "pre-scientific vernacular" with its inclusive, relevant typifications and generalizations, as a "treasure house of ready-made pre-constituted types and characteristics, all socially derived and carrying along an open horizon of unexplored content" (p. 14).

The Social Distribution of Knowledge

It is impossible to imagine a homogeneous distribution of knowledge. We have already considered the reciprocal intersubjectivity of what is known and its origins in history and culture. The moment one

person acquires some knowledge and transmits it to another, we have to consider individual objectivation and interpretation of that objectivation. More simply, knowledge is possessed differently by different individuals and types of individuals. It is not shared equally with all and there may be some knowledge which is shared with no one. Secrets may be shared with family, but professional knowledge may not (Berger, Luckman, 1967). It is a fact that the individual does not know everything known to his fellow men and vice versa. The social distribution of knowledge involves extremely complex and esoteric systems of expertise. Some knowledge of **how** the socially available stock of knowledge is distributed is a key element of a personal stock of knowledge. There is no specifiable point of saturation in the acquisition and accumulation of knowledge.

Although there is nothing in the structure of knowledge as such which would oppose the acquisition of knowledge by anyone, there are frequently institutional barriers to the acquisition of **some** knowledge, barriers which have to do with the distribution of power rather than with the structure of knowledge itself. As Luckmann (1983) points out: "Knowledge may be made sacred and/or secret, and social institutions may emerge to restrict knowledge to certain groups or socially defined social roles" (p. 66). It is possible to consider that the very groups and formalized societies, such as the Fine Arts Council and the Canadian Society for Education Through Art, set up to propagate and distribute specialized knowledge about art education, inadvertently do just the reverse. Members choose to belong to these societies and those who choose to join have already identified themselves as people with special knowledge and/or interest in art. General classroom teachers who are responsible for teaching art in their own classes, do not necessarily join these associations nor even know of their

existence. These societies and their members may in fact, paradoxically restrict that knowledge to a small select group of art educators. Therefore, knowledge about art education and how it should be done may remain special knowledge and become "common" knowledge to very few.

Common Sense and Special Knowledge

Discrepancy in the evenness and unevenness of the distribution of knowledge is one way in which common knowledge is distinguishable from special knowledge. Luckmann (1983) uses the term "general knowledge" (as opposed to special knowledge) to mean the common sense form of knowledge which is generally distributed in society. That is, common sense is the central core of general knowledge. It is the knowledge that allows us to deal with everyday reality in a pragmatic way. Both common and special knowledge contain explicit knowledge, elementary skills, practical knowledge and recipe-like knowledge of most diverse conformations. But it should be remembered that "what is common knowledge in the form of general recipes in one society may be highly explicit and fairly symstematic special knowledge in another" (p. 66).

Common knowledge consists of typified social objectivation of solutions to problems filtered through the interpretive and experimental contexts of a unique biography. In a simple society, this uniqueness of biography is a negligible influence, that is, in a society where there is a very simple division of labour and few differences in class position. However, in a complex society with a highly developed division of labour and social class, the situation changes. There is no common purview: as soon as social strata are formed around political, economic and cultural factors, the perspectives in which the same problems are viewed are no longer the same for all members of the society. The division of labour results in structurally variable as

well as structurally similar biographies. People with similar interests, attitudes and status cluster together. "The social transmission of elements of commmon knowledge is modified at least in part by class 'codes'" (Luckmann, 1983, pp. 67-68). For example, the common sense knowledge of what is art in the classroom may have as many interpretations as there are teachers. The teaching of art presents a common problem to the classroom teacher but the common knowledge solutions to the problem become differentiated into separate versions - generally distributed but in versions determined by specific elements of historical social structures (Luckmann, 1983). In fact, the problem of teaching art may not be perceived as a problem by all who participate in teaching art. It is possible that teaching art is perceived as problem-free and undertaken with an "I can do it" attitude in routine everyday ways. The routine everyday ways of the classroom teacher may or may not involve the materials, processes and products recommended by art educators.

The problem and some possible solutions have perhaps been prophetically found by art educators (with special knowledge) in advance of any general awareness of the problem. One question relevant to this study is posed by Luckmann: "Under what concrete and empirical conditions does such specialized knowledge (as that held by art educators) turn into common knowledge?" (1983, p. 70). Luckmann goes on to say that certain attitudes embedded in a historically given view of the world may either aid or hinder the process. It is this historical and traditional embedded attitude within the culture of the school that determines and identifies school art and its meaning. For Schutz (1962), meaning resides in "intentionality, which transforms an experience into something distinct and discrete" (Douglas, 1980, p. 126) - it must always refer to the intentional activities of the human subject. It is impossible to understand school art and its meaning to those who create it, without understanding the intention behind it.

It would seem then, in light of social theories of everyday life and common sense knowledge, it is important to attempt to apprehend and understand the common sense knowledge of the classroom teacher teaching art, rather than to merely take a distanced stance and criticize what is being done.

Chapter Three has presented a theoretical framework which deals with the nature and source of common sense knowledge in everyday life. It is from this theoretical stance that the data were examined. Chapter Four will describe the design of the study and the rationale behind the methodology used in the collection of the data.

CHAPTER FOUR

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Chapter Four describes further the rationale behind the methodology used in the conceptualization of this study and in the collection and analysis of the data. The design of the study is outlined and the setting in which the study took place is described. The two teachers who participated in the study will be referred to as Teacher A and Teacher B.

Procedure: An Ethnographic Framework

The purpose of this study is heuristic in nature; it is an attempt to discover the culture which produces school art. I hope to gain an understanding of the teacher's knowledge of the nature of art as it is practised and taught in an elementary classroom. The focus of the study is the classroom teacher as practitioner, working within her own theoretical and common sense framework of knowledge:

> The common sense world, then, is the arena of social action, within it men come into relationships with each other and try to come to terms with each other as well as with themselves. All of this, however, is typically taken for granted and this means that these structures of daily life are not themselves recognized or appreciated formally by common sense. (Natanson, 1962, p. xxvii)

The reality within which one lives and works while teaching art in a classroom is acted upon and interpreted through a composite of **implicit** typifications. Explication and understanding of these interwoven facts in the cultural fabric can only be achieved by the researcher through making the taken for granted the object of critical observation. But observation in itself is not enough; simple counting, cataloguing, or correlating provides only the raw materials of understanding. To arrive at any deep level of understanding, these data must be interpreted in a disciplined way, with the full realization that there is more than one frame of reference from which society can be examined. For example, through observation, the collection of artifacts (examples of school art), and the noting of obvious texts and journals of reference, I would **know** what a teacher does as an art lesson but I could not know or understand what the teacher thinks about what is being done nor the association with certain cultural and personal values.

If we were to look at the teaching of art as a game, it must be remembered that the particular game under scrutiny, represents only one way of playing. Berger (1962) reminds us: "There are many ways of playing. The point is not that one denies other people's games but one is clear about the rules of one's own" (p. 17). That is to say, the researcher must be aware of the rules and methodology being used and remain conscious of the goal - the attempt to understand. The interest is in **understanding for its own sake.** The researcher in such a situation is always aware of the possible applicability or implication of particular findings, but must make a sincere and concerted effort to leave personal values and belief systems behind and go into the field with the intention of seeking out another person's point of view. Ethnographic techniques offer a way to do this.

Ethnographic Techniques

The term "ethnography" refers to the task of describing a culture. True ethnographic description can only be constructed by tapping the knowledge of the subjects under study. Spradley (1975) says:

> Ethnography is akin to the work of cryptographers who seek to decipher codes. They make observations, but their goal is to discover hidden meanings behind what they see, to crack the code that other people are using. (p. 46)

Codes and rules are socially acquired - they represent what people must know in order to do what they do (Spradley, 1975). The concept of culture espoused in this study is essentially a semiotic one in that "... a sign is any object or event that represents or refers to something, ... a symbol is any object or event that has been assigned meaning" (1975, p. 20). The "events" that go on and comprise an art class represent school art in a particular setting. The products produced during these events have special meaning to those who make them and to those who cause them to be made. For example, one teacher in this study frequently referred to art products as "kinds of things" or she would say "the thing with wax crayons." She spoke of the activity one child was involved in, as "more of a free, art sort of thing where he was just making colours work for themselves and that sort of thing." It is this assigned, assumed and taken for granted meaning that concerns this study. This teacher assumed or took for granted that I would know what she meant. She assumed we shared a common stock of knowledge. When teachers speak of doing art "things" they objectify the activity and use the word in such a way that it is fraught with tacit meaning which must be apprehended.

Spradley (1975) emphasizes the important assumption implied in his definition of culture when he says that "... human experience and behaviour are largely products of symbolic meaning systems" (p. 5). This idea of culture being acquired knowledge relates to Luckmann's view when he states that much of the common sense is socially derived and further, that the process of derivation also "presupposes intentional activities on the part of the recipient, just as the individual's social stock of knowledge itself is originally built up and consequently maintained in intentional activities" (1983, p. 59). These points will be expanded in Chapter Five. Geertz (1973) explains his concept of culture and knowledge:

> ... man is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun, I take culture to be those webs, and the analysis of it to be therefore not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretive one in search of meaning. It is explication I am after. (p. 5)

To understand what is going on within those "webs of significance", it is necessary for the researcher to be part of the experience.

According to Geertz (1976), ethnographic methodology is based on "thick description - that is, a great deal must go into ethnographic description, beyond the literal." The images presented as ethnographic description are full of "piled-up structures of inference and implication through which an ethnographer is continually trying to pick his way" (pp. 7-8). Ethnography is an attempt to gain a deep understanding of the constructed social reality of the everyday world, to go beyond superficial appearances and discover the subjects' meanings, motives and rules which underlie what is observed. This is not to deny the reality of existing conflicts within those structures, or as

Jagodzinski (1982) extrapolates on Schutz' notion of multiple realities: "Consciousness **can** accommodate the contradictions, paradoxes, ambiguities of daily life" (p. 6). Ethnographic methodology takes into account the fact that teaching and learning take place within a **setting** and cannot be divorced from cultural context.

In support of this method of research, McCall and Simmons (1969) consider the data rich and direct and that the method "allows real study of social processes and complex interdependencies in social system" (p. 2). Rist says of the origins of this type of methodology:

> Weber's concept of **Verstehen** (intuitive understanding of social phenomena) has served as one of the cornerstones to this approach, an approach emphasizing the understanding of human behaviour from the actor's frame of reference. Of concern is always the question of **how** the world is experienced. A variation on this view found its expression in the work of Husserl, who challenged the notion that there was a clear separation between knower and known. "Knowing" was not passive, but actively involved the individual in appropriating the objects of knowledge. (1979, p. 19)

There is a need for the researcher to attempt to take on the role of the subject in order to gain an "inner understanding," enabling a "comprehension of human behaviour, in greater depth than is possible from the study of surface behaviour, from paper and pencil tests, and from standardized interviews" (1979, p. 20).

If the researcher were to merely observe objects and activities in art class, what would she make of a twisted coat hanger and assorted balls of yarn set out upon the desks of children? Since the ultimate purpose of this study is understanding and explication, it is important

to understand "the framework within which the subjects interpret their thoughts, feelings and actions" (Wilson, 1977, pp. 245-246). To return to the situation in the classroom, the children were shown a small, yarn pom-pom covered poodle dog. They were told that this was to be a "Mother's Day gift" and the researcher was told "they **have** to have something." What did this mean? Upon further questioning, Teacher A offered a reason that was socially explicable when considered in context: "The children take it for granted, they sort of expect a Mother's Day thing." When questioned further, the teacher explained that she herself, the child **and** the child's mother held the social expectation that something would be made in art for Mother's Day. Looking closely at that bit of acquired knowledge is a way of helping to explain how human beings interact with one another in a shared experience, how they exchange information to establish a common significance and come to the formulation of explicit and implicit rules for doing what they do, in this case - art. Mother's Day as a social and cultural event must be recognized, acknowledged and celebrated in art.

In the classroom, when children do art, their experiences with materials and processes are for the most part, products of symbolic meaning systems. They are essentially items which take on and embody social value and meaning to those involved in their making - the teacher and the students. To understand the experience and the behaviour, it is necessary to discover the assigned meaning behind them. Teacher A thought the pom-pom dogs "would be cute - my sister did them with a senior citizens' craft centre and showed me how." But not only were the senior citizens, the sister, the children and the teacher involved in this decision and plan but so was the husband of the teacher. He had spent three hours the evening before, straightening and twisting the

coat hangers into armatures. Wire is an appropriate art material but not for children of this age. Why did the teacher use yarn? "There's always lots in the supply cupboard." Why coat hangers? Because "they are always available - there are always lots of them." So it seems that much of what is experienced as art in school is conceptual, that is, there is some general notion of what **should** be done, a set of expectations on the part of those actually involved and other unseen pragmatic choices according to what kinds of resources, materials and human, are available. What is important and interesting here, is that the plans for one project in classroom art, involved so many other factors and influences which could not have been apprehended through pure observation.

In view of the complexity of the task of discovering what goes on in a classroom during an art lesson, several techniques are necessary. The researcher needs methods which encompass a "characteristic blend or combination of methods and techniques" suitable to the study of certain types of subject matter, and involving

> ... some amount of genuinely social interaction in the field with the subjects of the study, some direct observation of relevant events, some formal and a great deal of informal interviewing, some systematic counting, some collection of documents and artifacts, and open-endedness in the directions the study takes.
>
> (McCall and Simmons, 1969, p. 1)

All of these techniques mentioned were utilized in this study.

Procedure

This study was undertaken through participant-observation in the field. The researcher was present as a participant-observer for all art lessons initiated by two cooperating teachers in two different elementary schools. The teachers involved in this study were not art specialists, that is, they taught only their own classroom art. Inferences were drawn not only from what was observed but also from numerous verbal reports by the members. Data were collected through the keeping of a daily log of events in which such information as materials and organization was noted. All art lessons, including initial introductions, instructions and verbal interaction throughout the lessons, were audio-taped in their entirety, as were subsequent discussions, interviews, questions and answers. In this way, the researcher was able to keep a record of what was observable and of what had gone on, as well as of reports and reflections after the event. The interest was focused not only on the facts of the incidents but on what the incidents revealed of "the perceptions, the motivations, the world of meaning of the informant ..." (Zelditch, 1969, p. 8). Casual spontaneous discussions and interviews were taped, as well as more formal interviews where questions which had arisen from the previous day's activities were asked. The researcher participated fully in all classes, acting as an aide to the teachers under their direction.

The data gathering involved a series of simultaneous steps rather than purely sequential, in that, one day's data might generate the questions for the following day's interviews and discussions. What Strauss (1969) calls a "workable set of relationships" was established.

The Setting

Two elementary school classrooms comprised the formal setting for the collection of data. The classroom teachers in both cases taught all the art for their own classes.

Entry to the Field

It is necessary to establish contact, develop rapport, and maintain a working relationship with the people in whose lives the researcher is participating (Spradley, 1975). In one case, I had been a visitor to this elementary school while working on another project. I approached one of the teachers with whom I had had most contact. This teacher did not want to participate in the study, but suggested I ask Teacher A who was identified as "the one with all the ideas in art." Teacher A was very willing and cooperative and agreed readily to participate if she could "be helpful" to me.

Teacher B was recommended by a mutual friend as a possible participant who would be willing to take part in research. She agreed. Neither teacher was known personally to me before the study was undertaken. Both teachers understood that I would be observing and participating in all their art classes to the degree that was comfortable for them. I did not teach, but assisted the classroom teachers in any way they saw fit, such as in the distribution of materials, assistance to students, setting up and cleaning up. Permission was granted by the Edmonton Public School Board through Field Services, University of Alberta.

Time Frame

A schedule was established for both settings and followed throughout the research time from April 15, 1983 to June 16, 1983. I spent all afternoon sessions from 1:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. with one or the other of the two teachers. I was present for all formal art lessons and any integrated lessons using art-like materials and processes. If anything relevant or useful to the study was happening, other than what had previously been scheduled, both teachers called me and gave me the option of participating. Audio-taped and noted discussions and interviews took place during lessons, at lunch and recess breaks and in after-school sessions. A log was kept throughout the period of research. All discussions and lessons were entirely taped, and then were transcribed verbatim for further examination. From one day's audio-tapes and notes came the following day's questions.

In the chapter to follow, I will present an analysis of the data using exemplary episodes and quotations from the data.

CHAPTER FIVE

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The intent of this chapter is to present an analysis of the data in such a way as to disclose situational meanings of processes and materials chosen by a teacher. I will use the data in an expository way to view the everyday reality of teaching art in a classroom and to examine the objects of common sense thinking which comprise that reality. Paramount to this study is the discovery and understanding of the knowledge that guides conduct in everyday life and enables a teacher to "do" art with her students. I am concerned with a teacher's legitimation of the choices and decisions she makes with regard to materials and processes, and how her biographical situation and social stock of knowledge contribute to that legitimation. I am attempting to understand a teacher's intentionality and explication of acts as revealed in her own words. A sincere attempt to be objective underlies the interpretation of the data, but as pure objectivity is not always possible, I have tried to be fair and accurate. A researcher cannot perceive precisely what her informants perceive but can seek to interpret and understand through searching out and analysing works, images, institutions and behaviours on the informant's own terms (Geertz, 1973).

A Note on the Setting

Both Teacher A and Teacher B taught only their own classroom art in the classroom. That is, they were not responsible for teaching the art for any other class of children and they did not use an Art Room facility, except in one case with Teacher B. Teacher A's classroom had a sink, cupboard, counter and shelves at the back of the room, where most art supplies were clustered and prepared. Teacher B did not have a sink in the classroom, but did have a long counter and two work tables on which supplies were usually set. On the one occasion where the Art/Science Room was used, it was because tempera paint and brushes were in use. Both teachers utilized display space in the classroom and in the hallway close to their classrooms.

Art in the Classroom: An Everyday Reality

Everyday life is a world of daily, familiar, routine action. As a teacher goes about her daily ordinary life in the classroom, she does not question the fundamental order or structure of that world. Teaching art is one of the common, ordinary activities in which she is routinely engaged. The fundamental aspects of her life there are usually unquestioned but **are** questionable. In common sense everyday thinking, the teacher constructs a world of interrelated facts and actions containing elements deemed to be relevant for the purpose at hand - teaching art. To carry on life as usual, it is necessary for the teacher and the researcher to have knowledge of what is done. When Teacher A says:

> I didn't do Eskimos last year. The year before I did Eskimos. I used charcoal the year before with Eskimos ... so I've done the Eskimo sculpture with charcoal and that's beautiful.

She takes for granted that she and I, the researcher, share many common assumptions: I will know what she means when she speaks of "doing" Eskimos; I will know that the children did not sculpt with charcoal, but rather drew pictures of the sculptures as still life; I will know that when she says "I did Eskimos", that she means she did a unit of study on Eskimos with her students; even more, she assumes that I know that teachers "do" Eskimos as a unit of study - a Social Studies unit and as such, the theme "Eskimos" is an appropriate choice when related to art processes. So in the phrase "I did Eskimos" is implicit a shared set of objectivations. Schutz (1962) calls this "the natural attitude of common sense thinking in daily life" (p. 11). That is, the teacher takes it for granted that the objects of the world are accessible to my knowledge, either known by me or knowable by me. However, although there may exist differences in individual perspectives, common sense thinking overcomes these differences and she and I are able to discuss "doing" Eskimos or any number of art themes with impunity and little difficulty. As soon as Teacher A talked of "doing" Eskimos, she spoke of materials: "I used charcoal last year." Art educators and classroom teachers alike take it for granted that the use of a varity of materials is important and desirable in teaching art in school. A reciprocity of perspectives is taken for granted in that the mere mention of material such as "charcoal" will be understood and accepted as an art material.

Art Materials and Processes as Everyday Life

A large variety of materials were present and observable in both classrooms involved in this study, and many more were alluded to and described. There appears to be a firm belief in the need for highly varied and unusual materials, - the need to seek and find something different to use or make. It could be said that varied and interesting

materials are part of the "intrinsic character" of the reality of everyday life in a classroom where art is being taught (Berger, Luckmann, 1966). The reality of teaching art in a classroom is presented as everyday life interpreted by teachers and meaningful to them. Part of the everyday reality of art in school includes a choice of materials and the processes by which they are used. To speak of art in school is to speak of materials and processes. For example, Teacher A talked to me about her plan for an upcoming art project during an after-school discussion about choosing materials: "I'm going to do that frog one (project) because it's a **different** kind of art." She had just described a project involving folding paper into a frog shape. She explained that it was something she hadn't done before but it had appealed to her when her daughter-in-law, also a teacher, had told her about the idea: "That's the first time I have done it. Karen (her daughter-in-law) gave me those things ... her kids loved it." I asked about the children: "How old were they?" Teacher A replied:

> They were grade twos. Then she (Karen) went on to do a lesson with them where they actually drew a frog and made a pond and where they talked about them in the ponds and I think they had a little nature walk ... but then again I think she was relating it ...?

Teacher A appeared to abide by an unwritten but understood rule which says that art materials and projects must be varied and new. She expressed a need to vary the materials often in order to "keep the kids interested." Teacher A fulfilled this need by constantly looking for new ideas and appeared always interested in finding something new to do, such as the folded frog idea from her daughter-in-law.

On another afternoon during the lunch hour, Teacher A was preparing for the art class. As she was putting out materials, she said:

> I've **got** to figure out the animals (for a paper carousel) with maybe a sponge or something ... I need to try one and just see ... so that the animals are more than just cut'em out and colour.

Her search for the right solution to doing the animals was an extrapolation from an implied rule that says you must use new materials and methods. Even though the carousel project was something she had done several times in past years, she felt a need to update and modify it somewhat.

Teacher B was setting up for a fabric crayon project one noon hour, when I asked her about her choice of boot cloth as the material for this particular project. She said she had found that there were three types of fabrics already in the school when she started there. She had looked in the supply cupboard:

> When I went in, there were three kinds and this was the lightest weight out of all of it and I thought gee it would be better for them to work on than any of the heavier ones. I don't think I've still got their stitchery things. We actually did - I taught them how to do the cross stitch and the running stitch on burlap and that's all the kind of fabric work that I've got to do - oh we did weaving also.

The fact that there was available fabric in the school provided the idea for the fabric work. This is an example of the way the means - the fabrics - provide for the ends. Teacher B spoke of other materials she had used before finding the fabric and the contingencies which had influenced her choices:

> Having come to the school in December, it was really awkward because I was trying to put together two classrooms of kids and the problem was that one teacher had a split 4/5 and another teacher had a split 3/4 and they were doing totally different art

> things than what I was doing plus it was Christmas so I had to get rid of all the Christmas sort of stuff and then start from scratch. We've done pencil and crayon work ... they did a wax paper mobile.

She explained that the process for the mobile mentioned in this discussion, had involved putting wax crayon shavings in between sheets of wax paper and ironing over it, then giving the children "tracers of spring sorts of shapes like kites and bees." In this short episode concerned with materials, many assumptions are implicit. Teaching art in school is highly personal. Teachers have their own art repertoires as evidenced by the remark "They were doing totally different art things than what I was doing." Pragmatism often influences choices: old crayons had been used up for the crayon shaving wax paper mobile. It is accepted custom that art will be done around seasonal themes: the "Christmas sort of stuff" and "spring sorts of shapes like kites and bees." Cultural customs such as "Christmas" and "Spring", as themes for art lessons, are acknowledged.

The rule that says clay should be an included material in an art programme was implicit in what Teacher B said concerning clay as an art material: "Clay we haven't touched because we don't have clay here - all the clay that we've got is hard." Teacher B and the anonymous person who had ordered the clay for the school (it was in the school when Teacher B arrived) were acknowledging clay as an appropriate art material for the elementary school. This teacher shared information on clay with me in such a way that it was obvious she took it for granted that clay is a known material and one that would usually be included in an art programme, certainly in hers. Implicit is the understanding that we will agree on the significance of "clay." However, because all the clay in the school was hard and had never been used, this rule was either not known or ignored by other teachers in this particular school.

Yet even if Teacher B had been talking to another teacher who did not "do" clay and not to me, there is a mutuality implied in the dialogue here in that Teacher B took it for granted that both she and I shared a common system of relevances, sufficiently congruent in structure and content for the practical purpose at hand - the discussion of "doing clay" in a classroom. Schutz (1962) terms this phenomenon "the reciprocity of perspectives" (pp. 11-13), a construct of common sense thinking which characterizes the intersubjective nature of daily life.

It is possible too that Teacher B was unconsciously recognizing or paying obeisance to the recommendation put forth by art educators that a good art programme includes work with clay. However, Teacher A also spoke of working with clay and told of liking to "do clay" at least once during the year. But Teacher A's interpretation of the rule (you should do clay) was somewhat different than that of Teacher B. Teacher A had the children roll out clay and then cut Christmas cookie cutter shapes which were then dried, fired, glazed and assembled into a mobile. The end product of this clay experience was controlled and preplanned. The purpose of the activity was to make a Christmas mobile - the clay was the vehicle or the means to this end. In the vernacular of art education, clay is a known and indigenous term but one that is highly subject to individual interpretation as to what "clay" means. For the purpose at hand (originally mine, now shared) - that is, the discussion of art materials - the differences in perspectives are irrelevant until counterevidence is indicated. Had I as an art educator taken issue with one or the other teacher's interpretation of "doing clay", the discussion might have become problematic. But for the purpose at hand, it could be taken for granted by all of us, that we shared an interchangeability of viewpoints and congruent relevances (Schutz, 1962). We all knew what was being discussed, and were satisfied that art was being "done."

To look at the two interpretations of what "doing clay" in school meant, certain aspects of what Schutz calls "biographical situation" come to mind. The biographical situation of a teacher allows for an interpretation of the rule which says art in school must include work in clay. Teacher B explained what she liked to do with the material:

T: The pottery that I used to do - I haven't done it this year.

R: Was the first time you did pottery at University?

T: No, because I had done pottery and that before on my own. We did a lot of pottery because the school that I was at had a pottery wheel and so I could pot so I used to teach the kids to pot ... they threw on the wheel and that.

R: Do you hand-build too?

T: Yeah ... what I would do was I'd build my sixes up to the point where they would have a free project and another project to do at the same time and I'd take one out of the group and I'd teach them and I would go through ... maybe four kids in an hour and a half's lesson and I'd do them on the wheel while the others were all working and they all got a turn doing the wheel thing and then we'd do the glazing and firing and that. We'd do it all together. So I used to do a lot of it.

Teacher B, being a leisure-time potter, used clay in the school in traditional hand-building and wheel methods, much as she used these methods in her own work. Teacher A, not being a potter, nor having any special skills or interest in the medium, found a way to include clay in her programming which fit the system of relevances she upheld and coincided with her biographical expectations. Even though we speak of art materials and how they are used in a taken for granted way, it is impossible to ignore the many and varied components of common sense thinking which contribute to the way individuals carry out and give meaning to materials and to their daily life.

Teacher B spoke of an upcoming camping trip where the crafts would be done by another teacher and a parent:

> I have a mother that's doing a nature place mat where we're going to laminate the things that they're going to find into a place mat ... and a weaving thing where they'll make one of those belts.

Again, the use of the vernacular was evident and the implied assumption was that I would know what was meant by "I have a mother ..." (not her own mother but one of the student's parents) or the term "weaving."

It was assumed that some shared meaning of the term "thing" would be acknowledged. "Thing" was a term frequently used to refer to an art project or product. In the classrooms observed for this study, all art lessons included the making of a product referred to as "thing." The term "thing" stood on behalf of the anticipated product. Subjective reality is constantly modified and reconstructed through interpretation (Berger, Luckmann, 1967). This interpretational reconstruction is more implicit than explicit. The "weaving thing" referred to was explicitly a belt, yet the use of the term "thing" implies an open-endedness to the project, more in keeping with the idea of creative undertaking usually implicit in talking about art projects. That is, the resultant product will realize its meaning beyond "thing" only when the context gives it meaning.

In conclusion, both Teachers A and B talked about the utilization of a wide variety of materials with which to teach and make art. Feldman (1970) recognizes the pressure on the teacher "to introduce pupils to the newest and latest media, materials, and techniques" and writes that teachers feel an obligation to include new media and processes in their programmes in order to be "up to date" (pp. 159-160). To speak of art in a classroom is to speak of materials which will

result in a product or a "thing." This necessitates a process. It appeared that projects in art involved process as a means to an end. For example, in a lesson which involved the drawing of birch trees, the teacher knew she wanted to do something with a birch tree because of a song about birch trees the children had sung. She also had lots of birch bark from her lake cottage. What she was searching for was a means to do this and she chose charcoal as the means to an end - a charcoal drawing of birch trees.

In the case of some vermiculite left over in the classroom from a planting project, it was treated as a means to an end but the teacher was not certain of the end. She considered several possibilities - that material was there and she would think of a way to utilize it. She considered using the vermiculite in a collage with the charcoal drawings "for rocks on the shore ... if I had more time." So it seemed that much of the art programme was planned through the search for the appropriate materials for a particular product, or for the right product to use certain materials.

Materials and Procedures: Organization and Distribution

The way a teacher chooses to organize art materials and the use of these materials, may influence the choices made in the classroom. The use of a variety of materials and tools necessitates some way of thinking about their organization and distribution. During a lesson which involved folding a green construction paper square into a frog shape, the children had followed directions for folding and then waited while the teacher and I went around to staple the folds: "Cut it out. Now get those two cut out ... put your hand up and Raffaella will staple them for you but you must be in your desk this time. In your desk." And again, a few moments later, "Quick because we haven't got much time

so get rolling it. You put your hand up and then we'll staple it for you." This incident prompted me to ask about what materials and tools the children kept in their desks or which were accessible to them. I specifically asked if they had their own glue. Teacher A replied: "With glue it's slow too. Stapling is faster."

Later she said (about the time taken for the folding project): "Gee, that's a long time for **what**?" I commented, "So you feel pressured with time?" and she said again, in talking about how the lesson had gone: "Well, I think if we would have had time ... don't you think so? It was good enough ..." I asked, "Do the children have their own equipment? What do they have to supply for themselves and keep in their desks to have ready?" I was looking for some explanation of the **organization** of materials or procedures used:

T: I used to keep the scissors in their desks all the time but then I have somebody like Sarah ... the school supplies everything. The children don't have to buy anything at all. We are not even allowed to collect money for buying art supplies. But I **can** ask them to bring things from home if they have them.

R: So are they expected to look after a pair of scissors in their desks?

T: Yes, but do they? They used to be in their desks; somebody having three pairs and somebody else not having any and they were always shouting "I haven't got scissors." So finally I said "O.K. we will have to put them in the box." The glue I don't keep in their desk most times. But I would say grade ones probably not - grade twos, yes. The glue - I give them one bottle of glue at the beginning of the year. The grade twos have rulers. They all have pencils. They get pencils once a month, they get the erasers once in a while and they have all had crayons.

R: Do they have little bags or anything any more like pencil cases?

T: Well they are told at the beginning of the year ... yes at the beginning of the year we've had kids bring chocolate boxes but I think kids ... they don't look after them that well. I think it is because they don't have to buy them themselves. And they are all the same.

This discussion pointed to the teacher's understanding that children do not always take care of materials and that can be problematic for a teacher. I saw this as a way of justifying in retrospect her procedures in organizing materials. She also said:

> But when I had just straight grade ones, (as opposed to a split class) everybody had a box of oil pastels and that was theirs ... it works better when you have a smaller class. It's a numbers game. And like I said there are some kids in here that are just not very nice kids.

Again, the teacher justified her way of doing things by pointing out the large classes and the type of children with which she had to deal.

In Teacher B's class, independent use and proficiency with materials was very much expected and encouraged, as was the responsibility for the care of those materials. Teacher B appeared to view the practice of encouraging independence in all areas as something she was obligated to do for the children, for their benefit and hers:

> I guess what I like to try and do is teach them what I call work study skills regardless of whether you're doing a painting or writing a report or you're doing a math game - that you respect other people's rights and you respect their space and the work area that you're working in and the materials that you're working with are just as valuable whether it be a game, paintbrush or whatever. And being able to clean up in the sense that I'll do a certain amount but **everybody** works.

This teacher went on to say that what she felt was important was to give the guidance necessary to lead to independence so that "first of all they're not fearful of doing it - it's something that they become more familiar and comfortable with and secondly, that they learn a little bit of responsibility." Her children look after material because it is **their** job too, not only hers. She said her attitude was: **You** did it so **you** suffer the consequences." So if these children "mess up" or lose their paintbox, that could be a major problem for **them**, but not for the teacher. In her words: "You can't paint if you don't have paints."

According to Schutz (1962), a person's actions take place within a "biographically determined situation." This biographically determined situation includes possibilities of practical or theoretical activities which can be called the "purpose at hand" which in turn can define elements contained in the situtation which are relevant for this purpose. However, Schutz says actual experience will or will not confirm one's anticipation of the typical conformity of one set of expectations with another. So even though both teachers in this study might say they have the expectation of working towards independence and competency with their students, individual expectations, actual or projected, influence greatly the way they choose to come to terms with art materials, their use and distribution. Biography determined how they saw themselves living up to expectations. Both the children and the teachers worked in their own biographical context wherein the children did not see the significance of having their own materials on hand and the teacher did not have the expectation that they would.

Choice of Materials As Control of Product

With both teachers in this study, the choices made regarding materials and processes were usually made with a product in mind. Materials were a means to an end, or there was a preconceived end whereby materials were selected as a means. I brought up the point of the apparent importance of product: "Do you think completing the product is important?" Teacher A replied: "Yes, I think so," and later elaborated:

> But I think, and when I say this I am not being critical but do you give kids. (pause) Like R (a colleague) did a Father's Day lesson. The kids just had wood, had saws, a hammer and nails and go ahead. They did that all afternoon on their own. So you ended up that some people had a product, had a very good product, others didn't even finish. You see, I don't work that way now and I don't know whether you would or not. To me, I would talk about all different kinds of things you could make ... like with Heidi - Heidi decided she was going to do a van because they have a van. Now are you going to glue a van with pieces of wood together? She ended up - she had nothing. Now when I say this I am not being critical, I am just sort of saying I look at it and I say to myself, how can you have one child go home without a Father's Day gift?

I wondered aloud how this could have been avoided and Teacher A went on:

> T: And if you were going to see that they were going to flounder, you would probably have said, "well, look the glue won't be strong enough to hold that many sides and what are you doing with it." Somehow or other ... right to begin with, if you got what are you going to do from everybody, or what would you like to do? There you get lots of ideas ...
>
> R: And then you talk about whether it's practical with that material?

T: That's what I am saying. Whatever you call that kind of background, I don't care what kind of a lesson you have, in order to do it well, you have to try to get them so that you can stretch them at all different levels but getting a product, a product from everybody at all different levels.

R: Why is that important?

T: Well, ... would you go home with a very good self concept everytime that you never completed the art? ... suppose the neighbour's child goes home and shows something and the people are having tea together. One's got a product and the other kid has nothing.

This rather extensive episode is presented as an example of how a teacher legitimates and explicates **her choice of rules.** The rule is that every child should have a product at the end of an art lesson. The reason for this is given to psychology - "Would you go home with a very good self concept everytime ..." - and to perceived social expectations - the neighbour's child has a Father's Day gift (an art lesson product) and "the other kid has nothing."

The firm belief uttered by this teacher, that "you complete what you start" appeared to influence an orientation toward a product. This orientation toward completed products appears to be culturally felt by the teacher. This was indicated by the following exerpts from a discussion in which Teacher A and I were talking about the attitudes children have toward art by the time they reach junior high school, a topic brought up by the teacher.

R: Well, I wonder what happens to art? If after six years of elementary school, kids have art at least once a week and then ...

T: I think they can't hack the other things - options, like French, because they do definitely take a commitment ...

R: And art doesn't take a commitment?

T: Well, if you really want to follow through to a product. Yes. But if you want to just goof off ...

(and later)

> Lynne (a student) is quite artistic, but everything she does is slow and careful. She doesn't finish things as quickly and therefore her product sometimes isn't completed.

(and again, later in the discussion)

> Well, I think that probably the product that they have at that particular time is probably all the kids want.

I saw these remarks as evidence that the teacher's firm commitment and expectations as to product had been transferred to her students, at least in the eyes of the teacher. She justified her stance by placing the expectation of a product in art on the children.

Another point which seems to underly this cultural orientation is the teacher's need to maintain control of the organization. It appeared to me that perhaps having a very clear idea of the outcome of an art lesson helped a teacher to feel more in control. Teacher A cited the fact that she had "such a very large class and there are classes that walk away with it and I always have to have control, as you noticed." I had not said anything about this when she mentioned "as you noticed." She must assume also that others (the children and I) sense her organization. She assumed we had noticed her organization and control of the materials and activity. It was important to her that she knew what the children were doing at all times. Materials were dispensed and monitored closely under very specific guidelines.

Teacher B spoke of a past art experience where she had put out a lot of old stamp pads and let the children do thumb prints. The children had really liked it and had started to develop characters and stories. Their thumb print characters spoke with dialogue balloons drawn around the characters. However, Teacher B said: "I had to stop it because they got carried away." In some way, she had lost control of the context in which the activity was carried out. Her original intention had not changed but the mutability of the context had changed the outcome of her goal. Schutz (1962) writes that ongoing actions and motives are determined through projection and reflection. It would appear then, that in planning art lessons and experiences, teachers work from motives which involve ends to be achieved - preconceived art products. Maintaining control of context and product so that actions fulfill projected motives is important. Following a project, a teacher can interpret in retrospect an event to bring it in line with original expectations and to justify what has taken place.

On one occasion during an art lesson where the children were instructed to draw simultaneously with teacher A, the subject of the day (frogs), one child asked: "Can we draw birds?" The answer was a very emphatic "No, we're not drawing any birds." Control of the outcome was important. The children were also told during this particular lesson, "Now, you've got to listen because if you don't listen you are going to do it wrong." The implication was that there was only one way to do it right - copy the teacher's example. The use of colour in this drawing was controlled with firm directions:

T: Okay, Brian, what colour are the eggs of the frog?

B: Clear.

The teacher went on:

T: A clear colour - almost a light what?

B: Green.

T: Light - no they are not a light green - they are a light grey. Now take your grey pencil and colour the eggs and what colour did we say the tadpoles were?

When I asked if this was a usual practice - the children copying the teacher's drawing - the teacher answered:

T: A person that is too neat may never be a great artist because all they can do is copy. Copy work isn't exactly what you are looking for either because you are never going to be an artist if you copy somebody else's work.

R: But it may be a way to start?

T: Well it's got to be because the masters did that. Right?

There appeared to be some flexibility or doubt about her personal rule of always making or presenting examples, however either stance could be justified retrospectively. She said she did do this and all of the observed lessons involved this practice. Schutz (1962) says that we can say a person

> ... acted sensibly if the motive and the course of his action is understandable to us, his partners or observers. This will be the case if his action is interpreted by himself or others in accordance with

> a socially approved set of rules and recipes for coming to terms with typical problems by applying typical means for achieving typical ends. (p. 27)

However, it is not presupposed that Teacher A always has insight into her motives **before** the action. Her personal "socially approved set of rules and recipes" includes the practice of copying. Social approval is evident in that Teacher A is admired in her school for her work in teaching art. The projects completed in her class and which are displayed on bulletin boards in the hallway attract attention and admiring comments from the other students and teachers. Therefore, her "recipe" for teaching and producing art is a "typical means for achieving typical ends." However, by her comments about the copying practice, Teacher A shows that she is marginally aware of another rule - (one laid down by art education which says the child's work should be his own) when she says, "I really should do more" (work without examples). The teacher may satisfy the need to do and include art in her general educational programming, but how she does this is determined by what she knows of how art is done and how she interprets that knowledge. Her routine everyday practice of copying examples is not problematic for her - it has not been questioned. It is an accepted taken for granted way of doing art. The teacher's intentions were clearly formulated with firm outcomes projected.

Teacher B, on the other hand, shifted some of the responsibility for formulating intentions to the children. She felt if she allowed sufficient class time, perhaps one or two periods depending on the project, that was enough. The real responsibility to complete work then lay with the student. Certainly completion was encouraged and expected, she said, but it was ultimately the child's responsibility. For Teacher

B, the motivation to complete projects was sometimes the proposed function of that object, although certainly all art projects in her opinion, didn't have to be a useful "thing." She said she usually discussed with the children "whether it's going to go on a display board at school or whether it's going to be part of something that we're going to need for later." She made her intentions clear so that the child could formulate his or her own intention - whether or not he or she wanted to be part of the ultimate plan or formulate a personal plan. Often a purpose was suggested by this teacher, such as the stitchery project which she had "laminated for them so that they could use them either as a door thing - they had done their names in stitchery - or they could give it to their moms for Mother's Day because that's about when they finished them." Most importantly, this teacher felt "that ultimately it is the visual presentation of something" that determines whether it be hung or laid flat or functions as a book mark as was the case in a piece of fabric crayon art done during my time with this class.

It would seem then, that the teachers in this study have a propensity to interpret or make sense of what they do within the context of making art in the classroom. That is, the justification is made through interpretation and through the context which may or may not vary greatly from one situation to another. A need to control the context in which art activity occurs is one dominant principle adhered to and so lessens the basic uncertainty as to the outcome of projected actions.

The Socialization of Knowledge: Where Do Ideas Come From?

Common sense knowledge is intentional, and it is socially derived. Ideas for materials and projects in art come from a variety of sources. After I had been with Teacher B and her class for about a month, I asked about sources for ideas:

> R: Do they ever bring any ideas of things that they'd like to do? Does anything come from the class?
>
> T: This year it hasn't. I have had that happen quite often in the past, especially with kids that were really into crafty sort of things and were always into sharing things that they had done at "Pioneer Girls" and I had quite a group of girls that were quite accomplished at that and they were always doing things that they would come and share. A lot of the things would come when I would suggest something and they'd go: Oh yeah. My mom's done such and such and she does it this way. That's happened a lot of times.
>
> R: Do you do a fair number of craft type of things?
>
> T: I try to. Because I think it's good for their hand-eye coordination.

The assumption was that both the teacher and the researcher knew what is "craft type" and "hand-eye coordination." Teacher B seemed to be open to suggestions and willing to incorporate new ideas into her plan, as was demonstrated by her recollection of the "group of girls" who shared ideas with her. In saying that she believed crafts to be "good" for their hand-eye coordination, Teacher B demonstrated knowledge of the usefulness of craft and the importance of craft to child development. In other words, she was helping to make more explicit routine socialized knowledge.

Searching for and gathering new ideas for art appears to be a usual activity for teachers. At Teachers' Conventions, I have observed teachers looking at displays and making notes about what they see. This observation prompted my next question to Teacher B:

R: Is there much sharing in the school? Do people see the things you do and ask about it and want to do it or ....

T: That's one thing I've found here that they're very **anti** that.

R: Why?

T: There's not much feedback. They don't like it at all. Firstly, I think it's because there are not a lot of classes of the same grade. Like I am the only full grade three class. The only person that I could share with is the fellow that has the split three-four.

R: But for art activity would it really make much difference?

T: Yeah, it does. Because if **you** do what I'm going to do then next year I can't do it.

R: Really?

T: Yes.

R: Do people do the same things every year?

T: I don't. That's the trouble. I had a booklet that a girl was using on egg carton creatures and I asked her if I could have a look at it. She said sure. I said do you mind if I photocopy some of these things cause they had an owl character that I wanted to use for Universiade and it's made up in quite a neat way - quick little thing - and the kids could have their own little guy. No (she shook her head) no. That's **her** egg carton book and she makes egg carton pictures and she didn't want anybody photocopying **that.** Now I did manage to get one or two pages of what I wanted, but that's not the way I've ever operated.

This example of dialogue reveals a cultural idiosyncrasy peculiar to this school, but not to all schools, as Teacher B explained:

> But like at G school we had hoards of art books and you know, people were constantly going through and getting different things ... then somebody like J.W. she would never **not** share there. You'd never get a "no" answer from her as far as I need this kind of an idea - she'd give you five instead of one and you didn't have to worry that you were stealing her idea. But not here.

The celebration and recognition of special holidays is all pervasive in discussions about ideas for doing art. Exemplifying this taken for granted attitude is the following dialogue with Teacher A concerning the occasion of Mother's Day. I had just observed the beginning lesson of a project which was being undertaken as a gift for mother - a wire-framed pom-pom covered poodle dog.

R: Do the children expect to do something for Mother's Day?

T: Oh yes.

R: Do they start asking, or is it just ...

T: They take it for granted. They sort of expect a Mother's Day thing.

R: Is that true for most holidays? They expect to do something special for each holiday?

T: It varies. A lot of them - some teachers do cards ...

The teacher and the children appeared to take for granted that something would be done in art to mark such occasions. Teacher A said she was always looking for "something new, something different" that would make a good gift for parents. In fact, sometimes precedents are

set in terms of elaborate and very popular projects. New and possibly quite demanding expectations were set up which might then influence future choices and decisions about projects. The pom-pom poodle dog was one such precedent. This point was revealed a few weeks later, when Teacher A was preparing to begin the Father's Day project. She said:

> Now you know we made that (poodle) for Mother's Day and it was something very special and it is pretty hard to sort of top that, but I think that what we are making for Father's Day is special too, at least I think it's kind of nice.

For Teacher A, there appeared to be something of a see-saw pattern in the choice of projects. If something was done which required much time and preparation for one occasion, the next project might be something more simple, straightforward and less time consuming. The poodle dog had required a great deal of prior preparation on the part of the teacher, and several sessions making and tying pom-poms on the part of the students. The results had been considered very much worth the effort - the children were very pleased and feedback indicated that the recipients of the gifts had also been very happy with it. However, pragmatic motives influenced choices.

Special days as sources for themes and ideas were always considered, sometimes tacitly. Even when actual projects were not overtly planned for these special holidays, the holidays were always acknowledged - they were "there." The cultural presence of such special days was always accommodated in some way, or taken for granted (Schutz, 1962) as this dialogue with Teacher B illustrates:

> T: ... Christmas and Easter and that ... I've got a sort of little repertoire of things that I like to try and do.

R: Do you find that it's taken for granted - that the kids really expect to do special things for holidays?

T: A typical example was Mother's Day. Because we were getting ready for - there was some other thing that we were doing. Oh it was our open house for school and Universiade and we'd been working on that so heavily that we didn't do a Mother's Day card and Friday afternoon they wanted to do Mother's Day cards - like they really felt jilted that they didn't get to make a Mother's Day card.

R: And did they?

T: No. They could do their own thing - there was paper, you know, and they knew - but I wasn't going to spend an hour letting them draw - making Mother's Day cards when we'd already lost a lot of time making other things. That's why I threw in the Father's Day bit because I'm not going to make Father's Day cards either.

R: If they want to?

T: That's right, if they want to that's fair.

R: So you don't make a big deal of them all?

T: No, definitely not. Like Valentine's and stuff like that? Hallowe'en I like to do a few things because it's usually the beginning of the year and ... I like to use them for decorations for the room cause you have a Hallowe'en party and ... that's something that can be made use of in more than one way. But spending three days doing a Father's Day card and then taking them home?

Teacher B shook her head emphatically. She went on to say that she wondered what became of things like Father's Day cards when "many of the children don't have a real father in the home anyway." It would seem then that this episode illustrates a teacher's attempt to cope with the strong tradition of acknowledging Father's Day in the classroom and yet

accommodate a perceived change in societal norms. Her choice in compromising with the Father's Day celebration by suggesting that their current project be a gift for father, was a direct outcome or reflection of what she perceived as society's changing norms. Knowledge of the traditional nuclear family is not taken for granted by Teacher B. Spradley (1975) writes that the inevitable process of culture change, an inherent feature of every culture, is extremely complex and influenced by many factors. He defines culture change "as the process by which some members of a society revise their cultural knowledge and use it to generate and interpret new forms of social behaviour" (pp. 568-569). That cultural knowledge of societal expectations is always in a state of flux is evidenced by this dialogue about Father's Day. A teacher may go into a classroom feeling that she should "do" Father's Day. The reality of the situation for Teacher B was that one could not take for granted that there **was** a father in every home. Teacher A also acknowledged what she felt was a change in cultural norms when she said that she usually suggested other people such as uncles, brothers or grandfathers, to whom the special gift could also be given.

The practice of doing Father's Day and Mother's Day art projects is so embedded in the culture of the school as to be almost unconsciously acknowledged. If a teacher passes another teacher in the hallway, and asks "What are you doing for Father's Day?" or "Got any good ideas for Father's Day?", each knows that the other is not wanting to plan an outing for Father's Day but is looking for art projects to mark the occasion. Teachers try to meet what they perceive as their students' and thus society's expectations of what is taken for granted and what is traditional custom. As Wilson (1970) points out, teachers play to "role expectations" - those attitudes, acquired dispositions, conditioned responses and the like, to which, by their position or status in the social organization, they are subject. That is, teachers justify and interpret actions in terms of societal expectations.

Sometimes ideas for art activities grew out of other subject areas. Teacher A referred to this method as "integration," a concept which has been much touted by educators. She told me of an upcoming field trip to Storyland Valley Zoo and of some of the activities she thought might come out of that trip:

> T: Sometimes I have them tell about what they've done. And I thought how can I get that so there's more than writing ... you can get a mural out of it, and a map and making little directions on it ... I can see that and I have done that before ... I guess I'm a real person for integrating ... I really work with integration.
>
> R: Why? What do you hope to accomplish?
>
> T: Why do I work with integration? ... because I think that art can be integrated into every subject so it can be a learning experience in every subject as well as a good art lesson. So at the beginning of the year I've got to take the course of study and I take a look at the different things that I intend to teach that year ... and I think I probably go around the Language Arts and Enterprise ... and I look at each one of the subjects and I think what can I do in Social Studies, in Science, what can I do in Music, Reading ... and then I try to put my art into those things.

Teacher A said she put her "art into those things" and occasionally it looked like she put "those things" into the art. Sometimes the teacher felt the connections made between subject areas were tenuous. As shown in the dialogue about integration, she searched hard for ways to tie in art projects to other subject areas. She did not say she ever did it the other way around. With the paper-folding lesson where the children made a frog, it was the idea that had caught her attention - the product itself. The science lesson about frogs and frogs' eggs was injected as "background." This implied to me that a paper-folding skill objective could not stand alone. The objectives observed and discussed were

seldom art objectives. It was as if the paper-folding was only justifiable if the science lesson was put in as "background", implying that to fit the teacher's biographical expectations, art had to be justified by science. Teacher A recognized the frail and possibly superficial connection between the subjects when she said of the frog activity: "I think it has a little bit to do with what we are doing - not much - a little bit." The thread that connected some of the activities together was frail but the impulse to make these connections and call it integration was very strong. As Schutz (1962) says:

> In common sense thinking, we have merely a **chance** to understand the other's action sufficiently for our purpose at hand ... to increase this chance we have to search for the meaning the action has for the actor. (pp. 24-25).

I had a better understanding of the intention behind the choice of the frog as a project when I learned something of Teacher A's views on the integration of art. I understood something of her **desire** to make activities more meaningful to the children. Integration is a recommended and common practice among elementary teachers, but the interpretation of what "integration" means is highly subjective. When Teacher A spoke of integration in art, she referred to the use of common content across several disciplines, such as frogs being the subject of a science study, geography, drawing and paper folding. Chapman (1982) warns against the dangers of using the arts "... as a tool for improving learning in other subjects ... in the guise of 'related art' or 'interdisciplinary' arts" (pp. 25-26) and feels that this attitude may have contributed to the opinion that the arts are not worthy of inclusion in curriculum on a par with the sciences and the humanities.

Many ideas for doing art in school come from the celebration of special holidays and the marking of seasons. The recognition of almost monthly special holidays and events such as Hallowe'en, Christmas,

Valentine's Day and Easter, appears to provide a taken for granted, unconscious, temporal framework on which to hang or plan a term's art programme. That is, the seasons and special days provide a stable set of routine predictable events evenly spaced out over the school year and implicitly dictate what will be done at those times. Noting the enthusiasm which characterizes involvement with preparation for celebrations and holidays, MacGregor (1977) proposes that a teacher could readily solve the problem of developing interesting art projects by the "mere addition of several more festivities and holidays to the calendar" (p. ix). Chapman (1978) says that celebrations and ceremonies are important experiences in a child's education, but cautions that in making such expressive objects as Valentine's Day cards or special gifts, it is important to consider the meanings of the events or objects and how these meanings can best be translated into the words or visual forms appropriate to them. The connections she made between a song about birch trees and the use of charcoal as a drawing medium, and the science film strip about the frog's life cycle and subsequent colouring and paper folding of frogs, are made routinely, naturally and in good faith. The art curriculum as such appears to be formulated by the other subject areas, outside influences such as a child's idea, or a teacher's shared experience. It does not have its own subject matter. As Luckmann (1983) points out, general knowledge is socially distributed and items of specialized knowledge (i.e. art education, integration) do become incorporated into everyday common sense thinking. The structure of knowledge is the result of sedimentation of experiences in particular situations and subjective systems of relevances. Teachers learn how to "do art" by simple sedimentation, recurrent use and routinization, re-use with modifications, and new elements replacing old. Characteristic of all the projects made by both teachers, whether the idea came from another teacher or another source, was the use of teacher-made examples. This appears to be a routine practice.

The Use of Exemplars as Routine Practice

As has been shown in several dialogues presented earlier, working from an example of completed work is a frequent practice for the two teachers. On one occasion, the exemplar was a student's work, as these remarks by Teacher B indicate. The teacher held up a student's work and called it to the attention of the class:

> Ian went to the idea of doing a design. I didn't tell him what to do but he did a design. I think he was very thrilled with it. (And later she commented to me.) I think what he's starting to learn is that it is better to just try something than to just throw up your arms and say "Oh, I can't do it." What a lot of them are finding is that I'm not going to tell them what to do and I'm not going to draw it for them - they've already learned that. But I will give them enough alternatives that out of all the alternatives something will suit them.

By drawing attention to a particular student's solution to the problem of coming up with a visual idea, the teacher hoped to encourage others to try their own ideas. Teacher B was concerned with providing ways of achieving success but ways which might be acceptable to the teachings of art education which says the work should be the student's own, not the teacher's. Hence, the teacher made the comment, "I'm not going to draw it for them." The teacher is dealing with the "multiple realities" of the worlds of psychology (providing encouragement and positive reinforcement), and art education (not drawing it for them), in a common sense everyday situation (the problem of motivating students to do what was required of them). That is, knowledge of psychology and art education become part of common sense. All of these realities are drawn upon to sustain a sense of everyday reality (Schutz, 1962). When the

teacher commented on Ian's work, she used the term "design" in a way that took for granted that I and the other children would know that she was referring to a non-representational and decorative piece of work. This was confirmed by the teacher: she said she usually called something abstract or geometrical a "design." This was understood and accepted by the teacher and the students. The teacher used language that was typified as art language. Any example can be used as long as the typified language of art is used to address it.

Both teachers expressed doubt as to the validity or value of the practice of copying, yet both teachers used teacher-made examples, allowed the use of colouring book pictures for tracers, and provided teacher-made "tracers" of specific objects for the children to use. Teacher B explained her feelings about this practice from her point of view:

> I guess it's because I've found just through my experience in art that it gives them something visually to attach on to and to identify with, even though they're not going to come out with the exact thing I do ... often times they **do** copy mine.

She again expressed her concern for individuality in student art when she said:

> I don't like to say that alright everybody's going to do **this** - we're **all** going to draw a daisy or ... but a lot of times that kind of imagination doesn't come out.

It appeared then, that the use of such aids provided Teacher B with a pragmatic solution to what she perceived as a problem - her own observation that some children just simply don't have "that kind of imagination" required to proceed with their own ideas. In retrospect,

she was able to continue to create and to sustain the reality of teaching art according to what was accepted as "good" practice yet interpret the rules and bend them to fit the situation at hand. Ideally, she would prefer the children to come up with their own ideas and not all do the same thing, but practically this simply didn't work.

Teacher A said that "art has to be directed - a lot of it." Perhaps this perceived need for direction led her to routinely use examples with her art lessons. When I asked if she always used examples, she said, "Copying is a good way to start. It's got to be because the masters did that. Right?" Previously she had said to me: "You are never going to be a great artist if you copy somebody else's work." Again, rules are subject to individual interpretation and change according to context. What has been stated in good faith in one context is stated quite differently in good faith in a new context. This is not to say that the basic belief has been changed or discarded but it may appear contradictory in two separate contexts. As Spradley (1975) says, cultural rules are not rigid but depend on goals, available materials, the situation and many other factors. Teachers make and interpret rules to suit and meet the needs of immediate situations. Some rules are implied in the procedures and directions teachers give to children. Such rules could be called maxims and appear to guide behaviour.

Maxims: Some Rules of Conduct

The maxim which says you must use all the space was anticipated and perceived as problematic by both teachers in this study. The teachers often instructed the children to "use all the space" or "make it large." This was a recurring theme in giving directions during art projects.

Teacher B talked of this problem:

> I do know in a sense that it is a hard concept for them to realize that they can use all the areas of the paper, every corner and all the edges ... a lot of them don't. They stick it to one side or the other or the centre. Or they'll draw it right on the base of the paper like that's their bottom line and the rest is all sky ...

In another lesson, Teacher B directed the children in these words:

> Make it as large as you can. You have to write it quite big. Just don't make the letters too tiny. If you make the letters too tiny, they won't show up. If you make the letters too small, it is very hard to see - they might be too small for you to colour in. It's the teeny, teeny, tiny, little things that I see people doing - they might not show unless you're **very** careful.

The problem was anticipated by the teacher and as an attempt to avoid the result of making the image too small, the children were admonished to "make it large."

Teacher A said she also always emphasized "largeness," along with colour - brightness." She went on to say that "little children have a tendency to make everything very small - too small." Here she used one maxim to explain another. She said she thought that perhaps the reason for this was that "children see things differently than we do. They look for different kinds of things. Don't you think it has something to do with maturity?" The maxim here seemed to be that you must compensate and accommodate the child's inability to deal with all the space on a piece of paper. Yet the two maxims appeared to contradict each other. In one she said, "Children see things differently than we do. They look for different kinds of things." In the other, she compensated for this

"tendency to make things small - too small" by imposing a criterion of "largeness." When I asked Teacher A how she dealt with the problem practically, she said that questioning the children while they were working was helpful. She asked questions such as "What is the most important thing in your picture?" "What do you have to do to make it pleasing to the eye?" The implied answer to these questions was "make it large."

Berger and Luckmann (1967) might call this type of saying or maxim "... theoretical propositions in a rudimentary form" (p. 94). Such explanatory schemes are highly pragmatic, related to objective meanings and concrete actions. But learning about such maxims is important if a researcher wants to understand what knowledge guides conduct in a study of art.

What Can Be Included as Art

Both Teachers A and B used the word "creative" frequently in reference to art products, processes and certain children. Teacher A often described something as "artistic" by which she said she meant

> seeing art through my eyes - I probably look for something that - a quality, a finished product ... I look for a little bit more towards the things as they should be out in nature."

It appeared difficult for this teacher to explain further what she meant by "artistic" - the definition could not be stated or formulated in precise terms, yet it was an underlying perspective in viewing what was observed. I indicated the folded-paper frog just completed one afternoon, and asked: "Would this be considered creative or artistic?"

The teacher answered:

> No. This frog? No, absolutely not. To be natural they would have had to either paint, draw it, the way **they** see it. That would be more the way the real thing is. So when I look at artistic things I suppose I look at it through the eyes of how does it look in nature - does that make sense? But some people don't look for realism.

So it appears that "realism" is a criterion for creative or artistic projects for Teacher A. She also made reference to familiar art categories - painting and drawing. Teacher A also categorized the poodle dogs which had been made for Mother's Day gifts, as a non-creative activity. Teacher A considered that item to have been "a craft." She explained that creative activities were more the type where "the kids sort of develop the idea - when you let the child experiment with what they're doing." She went on to say:

> Sometimes when I think of being creative I think of having the children take brushes and maybe even go out and paint ... or you take these seashells and lay the shells out and let them create their own ideas but you don't do what I've done today. This to me, I don't call this quite creative.

Teacher A did not think every art project had to be creative. For example, she considered the frog project to be "a folding lesson." When she looked at a creative lesson, she said, then she would "sort of leave it where it can be loose-ended - the way **they** (the children) feel about it." In a creative lesson, the children should be free "to represent it any way." "But", she said, "I suppose the way I teach art, I look at it to be a bit more realistic." Again, realism was put forth as a criterion. But the children did not look to nature for inspiration

or visual information in any of the art classes I observed. Even after they had examined real seashells during the introduction to one art lesson, when the time came to actually draw a sea creature puppet, the children were given unclear photo-copies of workbook illustrations to which they could refer for their drawings. The real seashells were packed up in a box and put out of the way.

Artistic Children

Teacher A spoke often of "artistic" children in reference to a piece of work on display. I asked what she meant by this, and she replied:

> The people I think that have that extra little flair and have it every time - you know, that you can really see that they stand out.

She thought that if a person were artistically inclined "you go out and seek lessons and do it yourself and you learn by doing."

There were limitations to what could be done for these children in school: "It's partly time." The restrictions placed upon her by large class size and limited time were considerable in her eyes, nor did she feel that this type of special education was entirely the responsibility of the school:

> Like music - how many musicians are famous? How many are wealthy? Of course, every bar has a band, you could make a pretty good living if you really went into music but a lot of it is done on your own, right? It's not taught in the schools.

She said that "really, children are born with a talent for drawing just as they are for music." However, she did believe it was important to identify "artistic" children: "I always put it in their report cards - 'I think your child is quite artistic'."

Both teachers appeared to take it for granted that some children "can't draw." They recognized those who could and accommodated those who could not. Teacher B accepted one boy's statement when he said "I can't draw" and offered him the solution of finding "a big enough picture" of what it was he wanted to draw and then told him he could either copy or trace it.

By differentiating between "artistic" children and children who "can't draw," the teachers were able to justify the practice of copying as necessary for some children, and explicate the expectations placed upon "artistic" children by indicating that these children could **not** expect to get special training in art from the school. Personal stocks of knowledge allow teachers to justify their practices.

Justifying What Is Done

As indicated, certain implicit and explicit factors affect the quality and character of art programmes. There appeared to be in schools an implicit rule that art is a reward or a treat, as when Teacher A said, "Art gives them something to look forward to." Most art classes are scheduled for the afternoons as was the case in both participating classrooms in this study, not only with the two teachers involved, but with other staff members as well. It is generally accepted as a maxim that children are more ready to learn in the morning and so subjects are scheduled accordingly. When Teacher A pointed out a child who appeared very restless one afternoon during an art lesson, she said:

> She is worse in the afternoon. They all are. You know kids are a little bit more run down in the afternoon. They work quite well in the morning, that I have to admit because you know it is straight reading, writing and arithmetic and it's in their desks and they have to do a lot more on their own but I think with kids today ... you are doing most of the work and they are just half there .... During the morning you can push them a bit and have the basic things and it works better.

Art then, appeared to be what the children had to look forward to once "the basic things" were accomplished. The rationale behind this belief was explained:

> You give them a nice thing to do that they like to do and they should work harder for you on the things that they don't like quite as well. I often say to them, "Now, look - let's work hard, okay? Let's work real hard and after the last recess we're going to ..." and that gives them something to look forward to.

Implied was the opinion that art was something at which the children did not have to work hard. However, in Teacher A's class, no one was ever kept from doing art because of unfinished work in the morning. "Never," she said, "that isn't the way I'd ever punish them." So even though art was done after the other subjects, it was deemed necessary.

The scheduling of art lessons in the afternoon after the "reading, writing and arithmetic" are done, indicates the kind of tacit professional knowledge teachers have. The belief held by Teacher A that children work harder at tasks "that they don't like as well" because there will be "a nice thing to do" - art - later in the day, is built upon many years of experience, observation, knowledge and biography. It is tacit to some extent and because of this tacitness might be less subject to recognition or change.

With Teacher B, children who had not finished work from the morning were kept working at it while the rest of the children went on to their art lesson in the afternoon. Time management on the part of the children appeared to be a factor to consider with this teacher as she felt there was adequate time given for most things if the time was "properly used." Both teachers felt somewhat pressured by the lack of time for everything. This greatly influenced the amount of time given to art. Neither teacher felt there was a solution to the time shortage problem. Teacher A said she felt art was a worthwhile subject in itself, but when she thought of the "little time for kids to work in school," art had to have "only a limited amount of time." Priorities had to be set: "I look at a reading test and no way am I going to let these kids fall down on the reading test more than they did last year because I'm doing too many extra things." As Teacher B said about an unfulfilled plan she had where she would have set up an easel and paint for free time use: "It's just one of those things with the time. It runs out."

As we have just seen, both teachers call upon their belief claims, or stocks of knowledge, in order to explain certain practices. The cultural code in operation develops out of the collective experiences of the teachers. These aspects of culture provide the teachers with the means of coping with the demands of daily life within the classroom, or as Spradley (1975) says, each aspect of culture "... helps to reduce the world of experience to known quantities, defining the situation and providing plans for action" (p. 424). These items of cultural knowledge are also illustrated in the following section where the teachers spoke of why they teach art.

Why Teach Art?

I asked both teachers why they thought art was included in the curriculum and whether or not they would choose to teach art if it were not prescribed. Both teachers definitely supported the inclusion of art in the curriculum and gave a variety of reasons:

> I think we teach art because it's something that people enjoy doing.
>
> I do it because it's enjoyed. Kids enjoy art.
>
> I teach art to teach appreciation of beautiful things, beautiful things in nature.
>
> Once in a while it's just nice to do a piece of art work - a nice Christmas tree decoration ...
>
> It's another way the kids remember what they learn - like trips.
>
> You can give them art to have some meaning to art - something that will be lasting, something that will make them want to do it again.
>
> What I do is probably a little bit more towards helping the children to do enough art to make them appreciate art ... but I don't really like abstract art.
>
> A lot of art that I teach is toward this connection with kids being more aware of art out in nature.
>
> I try to do a fair number of craft types of things because I think it's good for their hand-eye coordination.
>
> It's fun - it's a release of tension - if they have had a bad day at home or they are not too happy - if people don't treat them well - it's like reading, it sort of takes you out of the world of troubles and worries.

> It helps with sequence in reading - drawing the steps or drawing a story in order.

Of all the reasons given for teaching art, few were related to art in itself as a subject worthy of study, a notion from art education. Art in the schools as observed in this study meant making things. Even though some of the reasons given for teaching art fall into the responsive realm, such as "kids being more aware of art out in nature," there was no observed evidence that any attempt to accomplish this was actually made. There appears to be a gap between the reality of what happens as art and the supposed or retrospective reality. For example, the reason for art was given as "being more aware of art out in nature," yet images were usually made from the teacher's image, not directly from "nature." When Teacher A gave as one of her reasons for teaching art as "being aware of art out in nature", she justified her rationale in terms of an idealized perspective which may be quite removed from the everyday reality (Schultz, 1964).

The Future of Art in School

Teacher A commented that "as you get older you probably get to dislike art more because maybe you've been a failure at it." "How does this happen?", I asked. She said she didn't think teachers intentionally made children feel like failures in art but she supposed "you do it by never having them complete anything for one way." Another maxim was implied here: incomplete art projects can make children feel like failures. This teacher also felt that children weren't given enough "background or content" for them to ever "do a good job." She believed that older children didn't believe they had to do a good

job of art: "Kids in junior high have to take an option and probably take art because it looks easy, it doesn't take any commitment." Or they choose it "because they are not good enough to take anything else, so where do they go? Art." These remarks indicate that the institutional world of art in school is transmitted - passed on to new generations of teachers **and** students - by way of spoken and unspoken communication.

> Generally, all actions repeated once or more tend to be habitualized to some degree, just as all actions observed by another necessarily involve some typification. (Berger, Luckmann, 1967, p. 57)

It would seem then, that art is expected by Teacher A and the students to be a characteristic type of activity. The cultural setting of the school provides the kind of continuing social situation in which this reciprocal typification can occur.

Biographical Situation

A teacher comes to her task with a unique biographical situation although certain commonalities may be shared with many other teachers. She interprets what she encounters in the perspective of personal interests, motives, desires and commitments. To say that a situation is biographically determined is to say that it is the sedimentation of all previous experiences organized in a uniquely personal way (Schutz, 1962).

That the teachers who participated in this study agreed to participate most willingly and cooperatively, implies a professional commitment on their part. They agreed to participate in research such as this because of feelings of personal and professional obligation to

other teachers and because there was an implicit hope of some reciprocal exchange in the situation. Teacher A agreed with these words: "If I can help you get what you need, then sure." Throughout the research she frequently asked, "Well, what else do I need to do for you? Are you getting enough ideas?" This teacher knew she had been identified in her school as "the person with all the ideas in art." She laughed when she heard this and said:

> That's strange you know, because I never really thought that I was very artistic. I had a sister that liked arts and crafts ... and I used to make flowers and things like that but I - the last while I never had time to sit down and do something and lots of times the reasons I don't do it is because I don't have the time to do it well and unless I have the time to do a fairly good product, I don't want to do it at all. You know - it's like the kids, I don't want to do something that's really junky.

This personal revelation by Teacher A concerning how teachers might unintentionally make children feel like failures "by never having them complete anything", was reflected in her philosophy and practices in art programming. Each child had to have a "good" product, and she took measures to ensure that.

Teacher A spoke of how she had decided to become a teacher:

> I wanted to be a teacher because I could see it had dignity to it, it was helping other people ... and I **like** kids. That to me was a different life style.

Teacher A justified her choice of professions in a retrospective manner, claiming that she saw dignity in the profession, an opportunity to help

people, and in herself, a fondness for children. In her biographical situation, teaching as a profession offered "a different life style" - a desirable change in her choices.

Teacher B's choices were also frequently made from within the context of her own personal biography. For example, when she said:

> I had done pottery and that before on my own. I had done printmaking in my second year of university ... and then I've used printmaking in a large number of ways when I was teaching grade six. ... I could pot so I used to teach **them** how to pot.

Her personal biography included a background of pottery and printmaking courses and led her to include these processes in her art programme in the school in a natural and routine way.

Teacher A again reflected on her own life choices:

> Well, I suppose my dad had some higher aspirations. But I also liked poetry ... I probably wanted to be an actress because I could see beautiful women in beautiful clothes. And probably with teaching - I could see **that** being - we respected our teachers.

As we have seen in the few foregoing comments, biography influences choices. This teacher summed up her feelings on the subject of teaching art when she reflected:

> I am just a generalist in art - I took one art course. I **have** gone to workshops and conventions so I know the techniques but ... often they have said that there are two occupations in life that are supposed to be the best and that's farming because you put in your crops and you have a product, and the other is art because you draw and you have a product.

CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, CONCLUSIONS and RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter Six presents a summary of the findings, the implications of those findings and the researcher's conclusions drawn from the findings. This chapter concludes with recommendations for further research.

Summary of the Study

This study was concerned with the teacher's understanding of classroom art, and the teacher's intentions behind what is done there as art. The study focused on the everyday reality of teaching art in a classroom wherein materials, processes and products comprise an art programme and take on meaning for the participants. Ideas or knowledge about materials, processes and products provided a vehicle for the discovery and understanding of personal biography and intention and the contribution they make in sustaining a sense of everyday reality. Essentially, the researcher wished to examine the nature of art as it is done in the classroom, and to gain some understanding of the meaning of what is done, from the point of view of two teachers. The particular interest was in the apprehension and understanding of the school culture, looking at art in school as acquired knowledge of codes, rules

school as acquired knowledge of codes, rules and meanings that allows people to do what they do, in this case, teach art. The researcher tried to make sense of the knowledge teachers use to interpret experience in teaching art and to generate their actions.

The study was carried out in two elementary school classrooms in two different schools, and focused on two teachers using materials for the purpose of teaching art. Ethnographic techniques of participant observation and interviewing were utilized in the data collection. The collection of data took place over a period of two months. Categories and themes emerged from the data itself through continuous and ongoing examination, and provided the researcher with a framework for interpretation and analysis. The data were analysed using a theoretical framework drawn from the writings of theorists concerned with the sociology of everyday life - Berger (1963; 1967), Luckmann (1973; 1983), and Schutz (1964; 1973). The findings were presented primarily in the participants' own words so as to reveal the point of view of the teachers involved in the study.

Implications and Conclusions

In this section I would like to discuss the findings from an orientation concerned with the sociology of everyday life. I will look at the teaching of art in school as everyday life involving materials, processes and the making of things as this is what I observed and understood it to be. I am most concerned with gaining an understanding of the teachers' meanings about what they did as art in school.

Art in School as Everyday Reality

Art in school is an integral part of the everyday life of the classroom. Much of what comprises art in classrooms is taken for granted and done in routine ways. It was found that to speak of doing art in school is to speak of materials, processes and products. The knowledge of materials, processes and products is apprehended as an existing, ordered reality, accepted without conscious questioning on the part of the teachers. I found that usually the materials and processes are specific to a product pre-planned and chosen by the teacher and one can determine the other. That is, the materials processes and products can be viewed as choices that are tied to situation, unique personal biography and contingencies of time and place. The teacher usually knew from the outset the expectations and intentions behind any activity. However, intentions were often justified and interpreted retrospectively. Doing art in school was "activity" - making "things."

Teachers speak of "doing Eskimos" or "doing clay" with the taken for granted assumption that the researcher shares a common meaning. There exists an assumed reciprocity of perspectives, a belief that what they know is known by me or certainly, knowable by me and the children. The doing of art in itself is an identifiable product readily available to conscious questioning, although not usually questioned. In common sense language, everyone within the shared systems of relevances in the school context, knows what you mean when you speak of doing art.

Art Materials and Processes as Everyday Life

Doing art in school involves a large variety of materials and an underlying belief in the need for new and different materials. Discussion of art in school is characterized by talk of materials and

new ideas for using them. Materials discussed varied from charcoal and folded paper to vermiculite and fabric crayons. Choices of materials were influenced by availability, other teacher's ideas, cultural customs and by the teacher's own perception of what were appropriate art materials. Teachers spoke in a vernacular of art in the classroom, using terms such as "weaving," "doing clay," "stitchery," and "mobile." There was an implied mutuality in the discussion of materials, and a taken for granted assumption that meaning was shared. However, individual interpretations of what these terms meant was highly personal, as was shown in the discussion regarding "doing clay" in Chapter Five. Materials were spoken of with ease and familiarity and this topic frequently set the scene for open and rich discussion. But discussion of the more abstract qualities involved in doing art, especially those used by art educators regarding response and criticism, provoked more self-consciousness and hesitancy on the part of the teacher. That is, materials and "art ideas" were easily discussed and more tangible, but concepts and philosophy were not. It appeared to me, that when teachers teach art, their concerns are pragmatic and immediate.

Materials appeared **not** to be viewed so much as a vehicle for expression but as a means to a particular and specified end - an art product. Skill development and mastery did not appear to be the objectives in using materials as most materials were product-specific - used once.

The use of varied materials and tools necessitates some method of organization on the part of the teacher. It appeared to me, that the organization and distribution of materials stood on behalf of the organization and distribution of items of knowledge - if art skills and techniques were not valued and relevant to the teacher's purposes, this was reflected in how she chose to deal with materials and tools in

regard to the children. Again, skills and techniques were utilized as a means to an end. For example, a child learns to handle fabric crayons in order to make the prescribed bookmark, or a child folds paper in order to "make" a frog, not to discover the qualities of paper or to learn paper sculpture techniques.

The control over materials and processes also controlled the end result - the product. I saw this control over the product as a way of guaranteeing outcomes and feeling secure in controlling context. One teacher in the study did encourage student independence in the use of materials, but guidelines were very clearly laid out and firm instructions given. Maintaining control of the context in which materials were used, and thus the product, allowed projected motives to be fulfilled as anticipated. In other words, "typified means" guaranteed "typified outcomes." Both teachers used teacher-made examples in their art lessons as another way of controlling the outcome, yet both expressed some doubt as to the validity of this practice. They seemed to be aware of the rule in art education which says art work should be the child's own, but found ways to get around the rules and justify their decisions retrospectively. Teacher A felt copying was an accepted practice because she knew some of the great masters had copied other great masters. Teacher B justified the practice pragmatically when she said that with some children the imagination required to come up with visual ideas, "just isn't there."

Socialization of Knowledge: Where Do Ideas Come From?

Ideas for art materials and projects come from many sources. Art projects served a variety of functions within the context of the school and even the larger society, and the context often determined the function of the project. For example, Teacher B liked to do Hallowe'en

art because Hallowe'en came relatively early in the year, and the room could be decorated with Hallowe'en art for the taken for granted Hallowe'en party. Special holidays and the seasons play a large part in the planning and choice of art activities.

Such a special day would be Mother's Day. Both teachers felt that marking these occasions with an art project or the making of a special gift, was taken for granted by the children. The subtle pressure to recognize these occasions was very pervasive. Teacher A overtly planned and spent time on the making of such special gifts, whereas Teacher B tried to ignore the occasion because of lack of time, but still demonstrated a need to acknowledge Father's Day when she suggested that a current project underway could become a gift for father if the children chose to give it.

The sharing of ideas among teachers in a school may or may not be a cultural custom in a particular school, as Teacher B's recounting of her experience with the "egg-carton ideas" pamphlet indicated. Teacher A, on the other hand, had been identified by another staff member, as "the one with all the ideas in art." However, my observation was that these teachers did not share materials or even projects with other teachers in the school but rather, worked in isolation. That is, teachers in a school did not plan together to "do clay" or mix paints to be shared in a painting unit.

Teacher A kept examples of past art projects in boxes organized by theme, and added any new "ideas" she might come across. Teacher B said she had her favorite books to which she looked for new ideas, as well as monthly periodicals such as Instructor which came to the school. However, even though teachers might not overtly share "ideas" for

projects and materials, a socialized sharing of knowledge and ideas takes place. As Berger and Luckmann (1967) write, everyone in a particular society (teachers in an elementary school) participates in its "knowledge" one way or another.

Often ideas for art grew out of other subject areas as was shown in Chapter Five. Teacher A referred to this method of making connections among subject areas, as "integration", which appeared to legitimate her practice of putting ideas together. The impulse to make connections of content between subject areas was very strong, but frequently the reasoning in terms of connection was weak. I did not observe any integration of **skills** across subject areas. The practice of using the art lesson as a vehicle for improving learning in other subjects may contribute to and maintain the opinion that an art lesson doesn't stand up alone and is not worthy of inclusion in the curriculum with the same importance as reading or mathematics.

Teachers do art for many reasons - "kids enjoy art" or "it's something to look forward to." Even though art is routinely included in curriculum planning, it is usually done after work in the core subjects has been completed. Of all the reasons given for the inclusion of art in the curriculum, few were related to art objectives or to art as a subject in itself worthy of study.

Art was foreseen as having a limited lifespan of interest for children in school, largely because it became an optional subject in junior high school. Yet to me, it appeared that art was essentially and implicitly optional even in the elementary school in that it was put off when more important subjects needed more time. Art appeared to lack the status of the core subjects in terms of priority but seemed to be perceived more as a pleasant way to relieve the hard work of other subjects.

Biographical Situation

A teacher's biographical situation essentially defines her social environment. All previous experience is organized into her personal stock of knowledge - that sedimentation of common sense, general and special knowledge which helps her to deal with everyday reality in a pragmatic way. As Luckmann (1983) says, it is the pedestrian way to cope. It is this common sense knowledge, interpreted within the context of a biographical situation, which is highly subjective and built upon experience. How these teachers saw themselves as teachers was extremely relevant to the ways in which they interpreted what art education should be. Although the common sense reality forms the matrix of everyday life, each individual interprets this in a particular manner. The reflection of Teacher A that acknowledges teaching as a profession with "dignity", an opportunity to help people and would utilize her fondness for children, reveals much about the sincerity of intention behind the choices made. That these choices might not be the choices of art educators is not important if understanding for understanding's sake is the goal. For the generalist classroom teacher, the teaching of art is not an expert affair, nor is it perceived as needing to be an expert affair. The teachers in this study felt familiar and comfortable with their interpretations of art education and felt adequate in teaching it. They experience credibility in what they do in that they see around them in professional magazines, hand-outs, on bulletin boards and convention displays, a reflection and affirmation of what they themselves do as art. It is accepted by the teachers in this study, that although as Teacher A said, "I'm just a generalist in art," they have adequate knowledge to teach art. A teacher carries out her obligation or inclination to "do art" to the best of her knowledge in a pragmatic way indigenous to her personal biography and situation.

Conclusions

It has been shown in Chapter Five that teaching art in a classroom is part of the everyday reality of teachers. Intrinsic to the reality of teaching art is the use of many varied materials to make some "thing" - an art product. Teachers know how to do art in the classroom through common sense knowledge, augmented and amended by additional experiences and items of knowledge drawn from special knowledge. I believe that the most important point of this study is the realization that a teacher "does art" in a routine, typified, everyday way - a way so natural and taken for granted that she may not need to be conscious of **how** she does art. It was also evident that when the two teachers spoke of where their ideas for art lessons came from, they drew from their social community, colleagues, professional magazines, and their own personal biographical history. To "do art" as art education would have teachers do it, would require explicit special knowledge and this has not been socially transmitted to them. Luckmann (1983) defines special knowledge as "knowledge which is routinely transmitted to clearly-specified social types" (p. 66), with access to such knowledge institutionally controlled. Is it possible then, that the formation of such societies and associations organized for the specific purposes of propagation and dissemination of art education theory and practice is ineffective in the present circumstances? Or is it that these organizations have the result of keeping the knowledge of art educators confined and specialized, available only to other art educators?

It seems to me that art education has failed to create conditions necessary to the transmission and incorporation of their special knowledge, and they have failed to recognize that what art education perceives to be problematic is not necessarily perceived by **teachers**

as problematic. The problem may not be seen as critical by teachers because of the traditional persistence of attitudes through which reality is viewed. The powerful reality of the culture of the school - the context in which art is taught - must be confronted and understood, and not ignored. Teachers do what they do in teaching art in good faith and with good intentions founded in their biographical situations and based upon their stock of common sense knowledge. Art education may be solving a problem discovered by, as Luckmann (1983) would say, prophetically minded experts in advance of a general perception or awareness of the problem, so that even the solutions remain for the time being, elements of highly specialized knowledge.

Everyday knowledge of how to do art in school is comprised of much that is individual but mainly of residue of information and experience which becomes conventionalized to the degree that it is shared among classroom teachers who are not art specialists. The cultural definition of art as it is perceived in the everyday life of the classroom is different from the definition of art shared and understood in art education circles. New events and ideas are meaningless until meaning has been constructed through interpretation and language. So until ideas from art education can be made meaningful and part of everyday reality for the classroom teacher, art educators will continue to be dissatisfied with much of the art they see in school.

Above all, the powerful force of deeply embedded attitudes through which reality is viewed, and the biographical situation from which it is viewed, cannot be overlooked. Teachers have inherited a particular view of art which has served to make it seem an object of some mystery, too ephemeral to comprehend, too much a question of congenital talent, and of too little value to be perceived as problematic. The pragmatic solution to this state of affairs can be seen in product oriented art programming, tight control of materials and quick and easy projects.

Everyday life "recipes" give us "pat" or largely unproblematic stocks of knowledge and rules from which to operate. Art education as put forth by art educators must become part of a teacher's everyday stock of knowledge, perceived by teachers as unproblematic and acceptable.

Recommendations for Further Research

There is a need for research in art education that is directed towards the classroom teacher which takes into account the points of view of the teacher and the child. Do art educators really understand the power of the everyday reality interpreted by the teacher in a common sense way? If classroom generalist teachers are expected to teach art, the goals, objectives and strategies of art education need to be communicated to them in a way which would gain their support. Methods of in-service could be implemented which would provide the classroom teacher with more art teacher role models, offering teachers practical strategies to take back to the classroom in place of "quickie" ideas. The common sense concept of "idea" needs to be changed so that an "idea" is not something a teacher is given but is something she conceives in her own mind. If teachers feel a need to maintain control of materials and processes, as seems apparent by this study, then art educators have to offer practical solutions to organization and use of materials in ways which would lead children to skill and mastery.

Research directed at assessing the quality of art in the elementary schools is necessary. This need was revealed in the data for this study. The elementary teachers in this study feel that negative attitudes develop by the time a child enters junior high school, yet teachers don't see their responsiblity in the formation of these attitudes.

The quality of art education at the elementary level is in need of study in order to develop some consistency in art curricula. Consistent with this is the need to assess the expectations of art curricula in the elementary school. How consciously aware are teachers of goals and objectives in the teaching of art? The teachers in this study did not appear to be conscious of art education objectives. How do teachers see the connections between sequential-developmental approaches in core subject areas and art, within the everyday reality of the classroom? How do teachers see the child's role and responsibility in the teaching of art? How does the teacher see her responsibility to the child and his or her art?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andrews, E. M. Reuniting body with soul: Art education in cultural context. The Annual Journal '81, 1981, 12, 6-10.

_____. The study of art in cultural context: Processes and proposals. Canadian Review of Art Education Research, 1981, 8, 25-29.

Arts & Activities. January 1983, (Vol. 92), 5.

Barkan, M. Transition in art education: Changing conceptions of curriculum content and teaching. Art Education, October 1962, (Vol. 15), 7, 12-18.

Berger, J. Ways of Seeing. British Broadcasting Co. & Penguin Books, 1972.

Berger, P.L. Invitation to Sociology. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1963.

_____, & Kellner, H. Sociology Reinterpreted. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1981.

_____, & Luckmann, T. The Social Construction of Reality. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1967.

Borsa, J. The status of art education: Case studies of art teachers and schools principals. (Master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton), 1978.

Brisset, D. & Edgley, C. Life as Theatre: A Dramaturgical Source Book. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1975.

Brittain, L. Art in elementary education today. Art Education, February 1976, 29 (2), 5-7.

Budahl, L. Ditto sheets and tricky projects. Art Education, 1981, 34 (1), 18-21.

Chalmers, F.G. A brief reply to Janesick and Jagodzinski. Studies in Art Education, 1982, 23 (3), 12.

_____. Art education as ethnology. Studies in Art Education, 1981, 22 (3), 6-14.

Chalmers, F.G. Aesthetic education as a social study. Canadian Review of Art Education Research, 1981, 9, 4-11.

_____. A cultural foundation for education in the arts. Art Education, January 1974, 27, 21-25.

Chapman, L.H. Approaches to Art in Education. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1978.

_____. Instant Art Instant Culture. New York & London: Teachers College Press, 1982.

Cicourel, A.V. Cognitive Sociology. Penguin Modern Society Texts, 1973.

Clark, G.A. & Zimmerman, E. A walk in the right direction: A model for visual arts education. Studies in Art Education, 1978, 19 (2), 34-49.

Clements, R.D. Metaphor in art education. Art Education, September 1982, 35 (2), 28-31.

Dean, J.P., Eichorn, R.L. & Dean, L.R. Limitations and advantages of unstructured methods. In G. McCall & J. Simmons, Issues in Participant Observation. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1969.

de Francesco, I.L. Art Education and Its Means and Ends. New York: Harper Row, Publishers, 1958.

Dewey, J. Art as Experience. New York: Capricorn Books, 1958.

Diblasio, M.K. The need for critical examination of belief claims in art education. Studies in Art Education, 1975, 19 (2), 6-9.

Douglas, J.D. Introduction to Sociology: Situations and Structures. New York: The Free Press, 1973.

_____. Introduction to the Sociologies of Everyday Life. Boston: Allyn & Bacon Inc., 1980.

Elementary Art Education Pilot Curriculum Guide: The Child's Image Making. Alberta Education, 1983.

Efland, A. The school art style: A functional analysis. Studies in Art Education, 1976, 17 (2), 37-44.

_____. Conceptions of teaching in art education. Studies in Art Education, 1979, 32 (4), 21-32.

Eisner, E.W. Educating Artistic Vision. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., 1972.

Eisner, E.W. The Educational Imagination. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., 1979.

Erickson, M. An historical explanation of the schism between research and practice in art education. Studies in Art Education, 1979, 20 (2), 5-13.

Feldman, E.B. Becoming Human Through Art. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1970.

Forbes, J.A. Art Education - Its Cultural Basis, Its Development and Its Application in Alberta Schools. (Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton), 1951.

Freeman, C.R. Phenomenological Sociology and Ethnomethodology. In J.D. Douglas, Introduction to the Sociologies of Everyday Life. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1980, 113-154.

Gaitskell, C.D. & Hurwitz, A. Children and Their Art. New York: Harcourt Brace & Jovanovich, 1975.

Geertz, C. The Interpretation of Cultures. Princeton Press, 1973.

_____. "From the Native's Point of View;" On the Nature of Anthropological Understanding. In K.H. Basso & H.A. Selby (Eds.), Meanings in Anthropology. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1976.

Gray, J. British Columbia's art education in the 80's: A neglected creature is acknowledged. Canadian Art Education in the 80's. Canadian Education Society for Education Through Art, 1980, 2-7.

Jagodzinski, J.J. Art education as ethnology: Deceptive democracy or a new panacea? Studies in Art Education, 1982, 23 (3), 5-9.

Janesick, V.J. Art education as experience: A reply to art education as ethnology. Studies in Art Education, 1982, 23 (3), 10-11.

Johnson, N.R. Children's meanings about art. Studies in Art Education, 1982, 23 (3), 61-67.

LaChapelle, J. Conflict between research and practice in art education: A sociological perspective. Studies in Art Education, 1982, 23 (2), 56-64.

Lanier, V. The five faces of art. Studies in Art Education, 1977, 18 (3), 7-20.

_____. The arts we see: A simplified introduction to the visual arts. Columbia University, New York: Teacher's College Press, 1982.

Lowenfeld, V. & Brittain, W.L. Creative and Mental Growth. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1964.

Luckmann, T. Common sense, science and specialized knowledge. Phenomenology & Pedagogy, 1983, 1 (1), 59-72.

McCall, G. & Simmons, J. Issues in Participant Observation. Addison-Wesley Pub. Co., 1969.

McFee, J. & Degge, R.M. Art, Culture and Environment. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1977.

MacGregor, R.N. Art Plus. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1977.

_____. The empty centre: Anthropological methods for art education. Studies in Art Education, 1982, 24 (1).

Natanson, M. Introduction. In Schutz, A., Collected Papers I, The Problem of Social Reality. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1962.

Polanyi, M. & Prosch, H. Meaning. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Read, H. Education Through Art. London: Faber and Faber, 1958.

_____. Art and Society. New York: Shocken Brooks, 1966.

Rist, R.C. On the means of knowing: Qualitative research in education. New York University Education Quarterly, 1979.

Schutz, A. Collected Papers I, The Problem of Social Reality. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1962.

_____, & Luckmann, T. The Structures of the Life-World. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1973.

Spradley, J.P. The Ethnographic Interview. New York: Holt, Rinehart-Winston, 1979.

_____, & McCurdy, D.W. The Cultural Experience: Ethnography in a Complex Society. SRA, 1972.

_____, & McCurdy, D.W. Anthropology: The Cultural Perspective. John Wiley & Sons, 1975.

Strauss, A., Chatzman, L., Bucher, R., Ehrlich, D. & Sabshin, N. The Process of Field Work. In McCall-Simmons, Issues in Participant Observation: A Text and Reader. Addison-Wesley Publ. Co., 1969, 24-27.

Wachowiak, F. Emphasis: Art, A Qualitative Program for the Elementary School (3rd Ed.). New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1977.

_____, & Ramsay T. Emphasis: Art, A Qualitative Program for the Elementary School. Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Textbook Company, 1965.

West, G.W. Participant observation in Canadian classrooms: The need, the rationale, technique and development implications. Canadian Journal of Education, 1977, 2 (3).

Wilensky, H.L. The professionalism of everyone? The American Journal of Sociology, 1964, LXX, 137-158.

Wilson, M. & Wilson B. Teaching Children to Draw. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1982.

Wilson, S. The Use of Ethnographic Techniques in Educational Research. Review of Educational Research, 47 (1), 1977.

Wilson, T.P. Conceptions of interaction and forms of sociological explanation. American Sociological Review, 1970.

Wolf, L. & Wolf, D. (Review of The arts we see: A simplified introduction to the visual arts, by V. Lanier). Studies in Art Education, 1983, 24 (3), 214-215.

Zelditch, M., Jr. Some methodological problems of field studies. In G. McCall and J. Simmons, Issues in Participant Observation. Addison-Wesley Publ. Co., 1969.